

THE  
ECLECTIC REVIEW  
FOR APRIL, 1842.

---

Art. I. *Theopneustia. The Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.* From the French of L. Gausson. London: S. Bagster and Sons. 1841.

No question in theological literature has been more fruitful in subtle and learned discussion than that of the inspiration of the Scriptures. It could hardly have been otherwise; for this question is preliminary to every controversy on the principles of the Christian faith.

Many doctrines of Scripture, having their foundations in received truths of natural theology, commend themselves to the instructed as carrying to perfection those views of the works and government of God, which are presumed to be discoverable by the human mind without supernatural information; so that, if the sacred books had contained no other doctrines than these, it might have been deemed sufficient to rest their authority on the same grounds with that of any other wise and good writings on the same subjects, only attributing to the former a higher degree of authority proportioned to their superior clearness, copiousness, or force. Even on this supposition, the question would arise—How came it to pass that these Hebrew writers so far excelled the moral teachers that had preceded them in other Eastern nations, or even in the palmy days of Greece, and have left nothing to be discovered or expected in the progress of letters and civilization ever since? There is no method of accounting for this superiority but that which is supplied by the writers themselves; and which is perfectly satisfactory, if the narratives inwoven with their writings are historically true. By whatever tests we try other histories, these are proved to be true, with this plain differ-

ence, that they are supported by kinds and degrees of evidence with which no other ancient history will bear comparison. The facts, then, of which these venerable witnesses assure us are such as to warrant the persuasion that their wisdom is, as they declare, from God, not merely as all wisdom is ultimately from him, but directly and exclusively by revelation. Let their manner of stating these facts be set down as a peculiarity of Hebrew idiom. All their idioms, explained by sound philology, resolve themselves into the singular history of the people; for 'custom in language bears a close analogy to chance in physics; each of them is a name for unerring causes, which we want either the ability or the inclination to apprehend.'

Taking, therefore, the lowest ground as to the contents of the Scriptures, there must have been, as the writers affirm, divine communications of the spiritual theology, pure morals, and sublime devotion, by which these writings leave all others at so unapproachable a distance. But this is not our ground, when we touch the inspiration of the Scriptures. The doctrines to which we have referred are intermingled in these writings with others which had never occurred before to the wisest men, and which indeed carry us so far beyond the ordinary spheres of human thought, that they are plainly undiscoverable without a revelation; and for aught that we can see, incapable of proof without a miracle.

These higher doctrines are not only pre-eminently, but authoritatively, *the* doctrines of the holy Scriptures.

No wise man believes a doctrine without a reason for believing it stronger, in his judgment, than any apparent reason for rejecting it; and in whatever degree it disturbs his previous modes of thinking, in that degree will he be careful to test the reason which is offered to him for receiving it. Should any controversy arise on the credibility of the doctrine, the attention of both parties in the controversy will, of necessity, be employed on the character of this reason.

Such, precisely, is the case to which we are now referring. The Scriptures represent the Supreme Being as sustaining relations and performing works, which, apart from the Scriptures, never entered into the thoughts of men; and there is a controversy among men appealing alike to the Scriptures, respecting these peculiar representations. On the one side, it is held that these peculiarities are to be explained in agreement with notions previously acquired; and on the other, that they are to be dealt with as truths which are new to us, requiring our belief for a new reason, which new reason is the divine authority of the Revealer.

We see no plausible reason for discarding the peculiar doctrines of the Scriptures, irrespectively of our belief in their in-

spiration. To our minds, we confess, these doctrines are so sublime, so harmonious with the history and the wants of man, so congenial with our deeper courses of thought, so interwoven with our purest moral sentiments, so conducive to our noblest devotion, and so consolatory in our bitterest griefs, that we cannot but regard them as of inestimable worth and beauty. The occurrence of such doctrines in the Scriptures is to us the weightiest evidence of their celestial origin. But whatever may be the soundness of this mode of reasoning, the divine authority of these doctrines is placed beyond all controversy, when it can be shewn that the writings which contain them are inspired.

Then what *is* inspiration?

From some expressions of both ancient and modern Christian writers we should be led to infer that, in their opinion, inspiration is altogether verbal; that the sacred writers were passive instruments in committing to writing the revelations of heaven; or that, at the most, they were but *amanuenses* putting down the words as they were dictated to them by the Divine Spirit. It is chiefly by images of this nature that attempts have been made to illustrate what is meant by inspiration; and to this point a large portion of the argument for inspiration has been directed.

M. GausSEN says, in the attractive work which is here translated, 'that every line was *dictated* as he would dictate to a pupil a treatise on geometry; or as Pascal might have dictated one of his *Provincial Letters* to a mechanic, or to an abbess; or as Newton might have employed a child to write the fortieth proposition of the *Principia*—a domestic to write the next—whilst he might have dictated the other pages to Barrow or Halley.' And, after vividly describing the incomparable performance of the organist of the cathedral at Fribourg, he adds—'Just so the eternal God, mighty in harmony of purpose, has successively laid the finger of his Spirit on the key chosen.' In these representations he follows the example of earlier authors. Athenagoras elegantly compares the sacred writers to a stringed instrument, attuned by the Holy Ghost to send forth the divine harmony of eternal life. Justin Martyr, too, describes them as presenting themselves to the action of the Holy Spirit, in order that his divine touch might use the human lyre to reveal to us the knowledge of the mysteries of heaven.

It may be convenient to speak or write thus figuratively in the current language of popular addresses; but the slightest reflection is enough to shew that such a mode of describing inspiration is exceedingly inaccurate. A human mind employing human language is as different an instrument of communication from a lyre or an organ as can be well conceived. Nor is there any analogy between the case of dictation, which M. GausSEN supposes, and

the compositions in our sacred books. He who describes what he saw, or heard, or felt, in language which embodies all the 'individualities' of his mind and character, is not in a situation at all resembling that of a child, a servant, or a philosopher, to whom the *words* of the *Principia* might have been dictated. We must be permitted to express our regret, that in grave and valuable treatises occasion should be given for producing erroneous impressions, and by means of such impressions, awakening prejudice against the doctrine of inspiration itself.

Abandoning so limited and fanciful a style of describing inspiration, there is no difficulty in apprehending it as the *immediate divine guidance of the writers to say all that God determined should be said in the way in which he would have it to be said*. The guidance is divine—not human. It is total—not partial. It is spiritual—not organic. It secures truth; but it is divine truth. What is said, is said to us by messengers using their own language; but it is said in the words which God has chosen *thus* to employ. In writings which are inspired, we have more than human genius and wisdom—more than human piety and faithfulness. We have the wisdom and the faithfulness of God. We have teaching which cannot deceive, conveyed in language which God approves. Let the instruction be modified as it may by the usages of the age in which the writer lives, by the idioms of his nation, by the idiosyncrasies of his personal intellect and character, or by the kind of composition in which he is engaged, as narrative or predictive, didactic or hortatory, argumentative or symbolical, familiar or extraordinary, still it is written under a supernatural and infallible guidance, and that guidance is θεόπνευστια—inspiration.

It may assist some minds that have laboured under difficulties in relation to this question, to illustrate a few distinctions which we conceive to be both natural and important, and which appear to have been overlooked, or not made sufficiently prominent, in not a few of the works on inspiration which have fallen in our way.

In the first place, there is a distinction between the credibility of the Scriptures and their inspiration. He who acknowledges their inspiration regards them, of course, as credible in the highest possible degree, inasmuch as his reason for believing them is the declaration of God himself. But it is not necessary to perceive their inspiration in order to be convinced of their historical truth. There is every element of historical credibility in the Four Gospels, and in the Acts of the Apostles, independently of any judgment that may be formed of their inspiration. Indeed, the veracity of the writers must be made out on some lower grounds before we can adduce their statements in proof of either

their own inspiration or that of any writer or speaker mentioned by them. Having proved that the authority of historical truth belongs to the records, we are then on safe ground for examining the evidence which they contain of the inspiration of the Scriptures. When we are satisfied with this evidence, our conviction ascends through reliance on human testimony to faith in the revelation of God.

There is a second distinction between the personal illumination of the writer and the divine inspiration of his writings. A prophet might be miraculously enlightened to discern truths beyond the natural reach of the human intellect; and either himself or another might commit that truth to writing without inspiration. On the other hand, a sacred writer might know many things by his own observation, by approved documents, by faithful report from others, by the recollection or consciousness of his own acts and feelings; and yet he might be inspired to communicate this knowledge in his own language and natural manner for the instruction of others. The remembrance of this distinction would prevent many of the misconceptions, and most of the confusion, of some advocates of inspiration; while it would go far to solve nearly all the objections to this doctrine on the part of those by whom it is denied. We are often told, with due polemic seriousness, that no inspiration was needed for the apostle Paul to give the salutations and familiar directions contained in his epistles. Now, granting that for these salutations and directions it was not necessary that he should be miraculously enlightened—that they were not supernaturally revealed to him as the doctrines and institutions of the gospel were, it does not follow, of necessity, that in giving these salutations and directions he was not inspired. The inspiration relates, not to the acquisition of the knowledge, but to the written communication of it for the guidance of others. It may be said that this *might* have been done without inspiration. Certainly; but this is no proof that it *was* done without inspiration. In other parts of his writings there may be proofs to the contrary.

Thirdly, we distinguish our belief in the *fact* of inspiration from any theories that may be formed respecting its modes or degrees. One man may believe that the inspiration of the Scriptures is, in all circumstances, the absolute dictation of the exact words which were written. Another may judge that this is the case in some parts, but not in others. A third may be of opinion that the substance of the communications was supernaturally given, and then left to the natural workings of the mind so taught to express it in its own language. A fourth may think that there was, in the act of writing, a restraining power to prevent such mistakes as would arise from the natural imperfections of

the writer. A fifth may advocate a supernatural invigoration and positive direction given to the natural faculties. A sixth may revise the foregoing opinions, and gather from them all a comprehensive principle, applying the particular opinions respectively to the varied communications of the sacred volume.

Now we submit that none of these opinions should be identified with either the rejection or the admission of inspiration *as a fact*. All the classes of theorists referred to may most religiously believe, that in the entire holy Scriptures we have the word of God as well as the word of man, and may most conscientiously defer to the authority of every part of these records as infallible and divine. He who does this is, surely, a believer in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, whatever opinion he may hold as to the mode or degree of spiritual illumination by which the act of writing was preceded.

Fourthly, there is a distinction between our persuasion that the Scriptures are inspired, and our ability to *recognise* the inspiration by internal signs. Many parts of Scripture are so spiritual, so holy, so sublime, so full of the indications of a present Deity, that the devout reader can scarcely fail to study them with the impression that it is indeed God who is teaching him. The other parts of Scripture—its narratives, its genealogies, its brief notices of persons, places, and comparatively unimportant circumstances—are confessedly not of this character. In these parts we may not, at first, have the same impression of divinity as in the others. But this difference does not destroy the inspiration of any of the parts, neither does it weaken the persuasion, founded on other facts and statements, that the whole is inspired. This is a question of evidence addressed to the judgment, not of appeals made to the imagination or the feelings. When this evidence has been examined, and the result is a belief in the inspiration of all the Scripture, the same reverential feeling may be excited by all the communications of the holy volume, just as the same adoration of wisdom and goodness is awakened by the contemplation of a feather, or of an oak, by the structure of an insect, or by the courses of the stars.

There is yet a fifth distinction on which we are disposed to dwell, from a conviction of its special value in the elucidation of this subject. It is the distinction between a belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures which is the result of just reasoning from a comparison of separate facts, and a belief in the same inspiration which rests on the assertion of a previously-admitted divine authority. It cannot be unknown to any of our readers that the inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures is to the Christian church an article of faith—faith in the declarations of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of his apostles. Believing that the New Testa-

ment contains the words of our Saviour, and that his apostles were commissioned by him to teach all nations, we have the fullest assurance that whatever he or any of his apostles has said of the ancient Scriptures must be true, and that we are authorized to receive it on the ground of their declaration. Finding, then, that they refer to the ancient Scriptures,—to particular parts, and to the entire collection,—as the ‘word of God,’ the ‘oracles of God,’ ‘given by inspiration of God,’ Christians have no hesitation in receiving the Old Testament, according to the known canon at the time of our Saviour, as inspired.

With regard to the entire New Testament, however, we seem to have no similar declarations. It is thought by some, we know, that the final verses of the Apocalypse are of this nature. For those who so regard those verses, that testimony of Jesus bears the same relation to the entire Scriptures which his previous declarations and those of his apostles bear to the Old Testament. But in the judgment of many thoughtful and well-instructed Christians, the verses alluded to are confined in their reference to the Apocalypse itself, though, of course, their principle applies to every other inspired writing. In either case there is no express enunciation of the fact that all the New Testament is inspired, analogous to that which we hold in reference to the entire Old Testament. Notwithstanding this difference, there may be sufficient reasons for believing that the Scriptures, including the New Testament with the Old, are all inspired of God. If it is true that they are inspired, and if we have the means of knowing that they are, it is certainly our duty to use those means, and having so used them as to arrive at the truth, that truth demands and sanctions our reverence for the divine authority of the whole Scripture. The kind of process by which we reach the conviction cannot nullify the practical consequences resulting from it when we have reached it. If, without such a process as we should recommend, the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures is held, for whatever reasons, all the moral consequences of this truth are binding on him who so believes it. On the contrary, if the inquiry which would lead to this truth is neglected, and the truth itself denied, it is no justification of this denial to plead that the doctrine is not explicitly revealed in some one simple and authoritative declaration: no man has a right to prescribe the manner in which the evidence of sacred truth shall be laid before him. The plain declaration, by competent authority, that the whole New Testament is inspired, would of course be ample ground for receiving it as such, and this reception would be an element of our religious faith. Yet, without such a declaration, there may be satisfactory reasons for holding this doctrine, as a

truth deduced from a calm and rational examination of the Scriptures.

There are other distinctions on which we might have enlarged. Those which have been advanced are respectfully suggested to the consideration of persons who have thought, or who are disposed to think, on this very important question.

In M. GausSEN's able work, some of these distinctions have been happily observed, whilst others, *especially the last*, have not received from him their due measure of attention. He has taken admirable pains to separate the illumination, feelings, and character of the authors, from the inspiration of the writings. He has converted some of the objections against inspiration into splendid proofs of its reality. He has solved many of the difficulties supposed to arise from translations, various readings, and alleged contradictions. He has successfully vindicated the sacred writings from the charge of containing statements opposed to the truths of physical science. And he has evinced a respectable degree of research, acuteness of observation, and facility of analytic reasoning, in the treatment of most of these points. His composition is also enlivened by a warm tone of colouring which engages our good opinion of his talents and character, and which will strongly predispose the greater part of his readers towards his arguments. With him the inspiration of the Scriptures is no cold speculation, but a living faith; not a theological dogma, but a practical principle.

' We have asserted that it is God who speaks to us; but, cast into earthly mould, it is also man: it is man; but it is also God. Oh! admirable word of my God! cast, so to speak, in human mould, like the eternal Word. Yes,—God sent it down to us, full of grace and truth; similar to human words in every respect, error and sin excepted. Admirable and divine Word!—but replete with humanity,—gracious Word of my God! Yes, in order that we might understand it, mortal lips must be employed to tell of human things; and to win us, the characteristics of our thoughts, and all the expression of our emotions must be clothed upon, because God knoweth our frame. But recognise it to be the Word of the Lord, 'quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword,' and the most simple among us, understanding it, can say, like Cleopas and his companion,—' Have we not felt our hearts burn within us, while it has spoken to us ?'

' How greatly does this abounding humanity, and all this personality with which the divinity of the Scriptures is invested, charm us; reminding us that the Saviour of our souls, whose touching voice they are, himself bears a human heart on the throne of God, although seated on high, where angels serve and for ever adore him! It is thus, also, that they present to us not only that double character of variety and unity, which has ever adorned all the other works of God, as Creator

of heaven and earth; but, moreover, that intermingling of familiarity with authority; of sympathy with greatness; of practical details with mysterious majesty; and of humanity with divinity, which are manifested in all the dispensations of the same God, as the Redeemer and Shepherd of his church. In like manner the Father of mercies, when speaking in his prophets, was pleased not only to employ their manner as well as their voice; their style as well as their pen; but also often to bring into use their faculties of judging and feeling. At one time, to exhibit to us his divine sympathy, he has seen fit to combine their own recollections, their human convictions, their personal experience and devout emotions, in the words which he dictated to them; and at another, for the purpose of manifesting to us his sovereign intervention, he has preferred to dispense with this *unessential* association of their memory, affections, and intelligence.

'Such ought to be the Word of God—like Emmanuel—full of grace and truth; at once in the bosom of God and in the heart of man; powerful and sympathizing; celestial and human; exalted, yet humble; imposing and familiar; God and man! This bears no resemblance to the God of rationalists.'—pp. 62—64.

Our gratification in reading such passages is disturbed by indications of mental habits which are not the most favourable to the discussion of the great question to which his pages are devoted. We are unwilling to indulge in what might look like captious criticism on a work which we so greatly admire; yet we must not conceal from our readers a few of the indications to which we have adverted.

The sentences are sometimes tinctured with a dogmatic harshness which we should have been glad to dispense with, and which we are sure might have been avoided without at all obscuring the clearness of the doctrine, or enfeebling the vigour of the argument.—A particular and popular theory of inspiration is laid down, and all other theories are treated as either denials of the fact, or as evasions of the truth. In this spirit, certain modes of regarding inspiration by others are scouted with unsparing severity, although similar modes of regarding it are adopted in other portions of the volume.—He condemns all attempts at shewing wherein inspiration consists, whilst the greater part of the essay is an exhibition of what he considers it to be. He makes statements as if peculiar to his theory, which would be cheerfully responded to by many who, after fair examination, are unable to embrace it.—He very erroneously represents views of inspiration *derived from the actual contents of Scripture*, as an *à priori* theory of what inspiration must be.—He confounds the mode in which men communicate their thoughts to one another, with what he appropriately designates, 'the mysterious power'—'the inexplicable power, by which the Divine Spirit guided the authors of the sacred volume to the words which they em-

ployed.'—He takes for granted, instead of proving, that the inspiration of the whole New Testament is affirmed by the writers as a doctrine of our faith.—His arrangement and his general tone betray a mind so full of an exclusive theory, and so anxious for its reception, as nearly to disqualify him for the free discussion of all the particulars which that theory comprises, or of the reasonings by which other writers, holding equally with himself the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, have vindicated a more comprehensive view of what is meant by inspiration than that which he propounds.

While M. GausSEN has, by his own acknowledgment, been greatly assisted by Dr. Rudelbach, and by the popular writings of Mr. Haldane and Mr. Carson, (alluding in passing terms of censure to other English writers,) he has not noticed, and we are inclined to suspect has not read, the learned and disquisitive lectures of Dr. Henderson, published in London five years ago, well known in Germany and in America, and we had supposed also in Switzerland. In those lectures the semi-infidel rationalism of Le Clerc, Semler, De Wette, Paulus, and their numerous disciples, is refuted with equal skill and scholarship; and at the same time the 'antiquated hypothesis' to which M. GausSEN is now lending the attractions of his genius is shewn to be neither required by the language of Scripture nor supported by the facts of the case.\*

This hypothesis is—the verbal inspiration of the entire Scriptures. If by this theory is meant that every word of Scripture was *dictated* to the sacred writer so as to leave no scope, in writing, to the operations of his intellect, his memory, his reason, or his choice of words and phrases, then, according to our apprehension, the theory is at variance with the declarations of the sacred writers; it is contradicted by the internal character of their writings, as compared with each other; it is inconsistent with itself; and it destroys one proof of the genuineness of the writings,—thus indirectly weakening, so far as it goes, the evidence of the fact which it professes to explain.

No believer in inspiration denies that large portions of Scripture contain the very words of God miraculously communicated to the writers; but the same reason which induces this belief forbids a similar conclusion in reference to other portions of the same writings. If the doctrine of inspiration is to be *intelligently* held, our belief must result from a serious examination of what the Scriptures teach respecting their own origin, and, as part of this examination, a judicious comparison of cases that are clearly analogous to each other. But the examination would be vitiated

\* Eclectic Review, February, 1837.

if we entered on it with a pre-conceived opinion of what inspiration is ; for that is *the point to be ascertained*. To investigate that point is the part at once of manly reason and of humble piety : that reason is not manly which is not humble, neither is that piety humble which will not reason. Such an exercise of judgment must take place before we can have an enlightened and thoroughly satisfactory assurance of the inspiration of the Scriptures. If this were a matter of simply dogmatic truth resting on positive declarations, it would still be our duty to inquire what such declarations mean ; and how could we discover their meaning otherwise than by a patient study of the terms and of the connexions in which we find them ? This act of considering is not denial, it is not doubt, it is not testing the doctrine by our reason ; it is seeking to know what the doctrine is, that we may devoutly believe it and yield ourselves to all its consequences. How mischievous, then, must the tendency of such writings as would disparage our inquiries in this direction, by representing our honest endeavour as sitting in judgment on the Word of God, making ourselves oracles, and constituting our own reason as the deity of the temple, instead of worshipping HIM who fills it with his glory ! Are we not to *judge* whether the Scriptures claim to be inspired ? And are we not to form a conception of what we mean when we say that we believe them to be inspired ?

If, however, by verbal inspiration we are to understand that the words are in all cases those which the writers of the Scriptures were supernaturally guided to employ, this is fully maintained by those 'English theologians' who find no favour in the eyes of M. GausSEN.— 'We cannot suppose that when they were most at liberty, they were in no degree directed by a secret influence in the selection of words and phrases. It was of the utmost importance that the facts and observations which God intended for the instruction of mankind in all ages should be properly expressed ; and there was a danger that errors would be committed by such persons as the penmen of the Scriptures, the greater part of whom were illiterate and ignorant of the art of composition. If we had nothing to depend upon but their own skill and attention, we could have no certainty that the statements are always accurate, and our piety would be frequently disturbed by the suspicion that what is only a difficulty might be a mistake. It must be granted that even in relating what they knew, what they had seen, what they had learned from the testimony of others, the sacred writers were assisted, although we should concede only that occasionally a more proper word or expression was suggested to them than would have occurred to themselves ; and, consequently, the style was not

strictly their own, but was a style corrected and improved, and different from what they would have spontaneously used.\*

'It was essential,' says Dr. Pye Smith, 'that they should have constantly present to their minds perfect notions of the whole and of every part, and that they should be enabled to clothe these notions in words the best adapted to the purpose.'† 'There is no portion of that holy book,' says Dr. Henderson, 'which was written independently of miraculous influence . . . The whole volume is divinely inspired. Every part is to be received in the light in which it has been presented by the Holy Spirit; and it is to be applied to the holy purposes for which He has caused it to be written . . . In the minute as well as in the great, in matters which relate to civil life and personal comfort, as well as in those which respect the soul and the world to come, the Divine wisdom is apparent; so that in contemplating the most inconsiderable of them, we are compelled to say:—'This also cometh forth from the Lord of Hosts, who is wonderful in council and excellent in working.'‡

'When these writings come to be perused,' says Dr. Doddridge, in his 'Dissertation on the Inspiration of the Scripture,' 'it is evident to me that honest and worthy men would never have pretended to have written in such a manner if they had not been conscious of superior direction, and extraordinary divine influence . . . I cannot conceive that any reader will be so unreasonable as to imagine these things could have been written with any exactness by the apostles, if they had not been miraculously assisted in recording them . . . I hope I have by this time convinced my readers that it is agreeable to the other circumstances of the apostles' story, and to the promises which our Lord so largely and so frequently made to them, (and the frequent repetition of the promise strongly insinuates the importance of it,) to suppose that they were, indeed, favoured with a *full* inspiration in their writings.'

Now, if we understand M. GausSEN, the views of Drs. Doddridge, Dick, Smith, and Henderson, do not differ substantially from his own. He acknowledges that 'the energy of inspiration was not felt in equal degree by each of them; that 'their experience was not uniform; and that it is 'God who speaks, who relates, ordains, or reveals, by their instrumentality, and for this purpose employs, *in various degrees*, their personality. If the words are always those of men, because written by men, they are also the words of God, because it is he who *oversees, employs, and guides them.*'

\* Dr. Dick's Lectures, vol. i. lec. xi. p. 204, (published 1831.)

† Scrip. Test., vol. i. p. 97. (Third edition.)

‡ Lectures on Inspiration, pp. 385—387.

Seeing, then, that there is this substantial agreement between the views of inspiration held by the 'English theologians' and those of M. GausSEN, we question the accuracy (might we not add, the fairness?) of the following observations:—

'It is the volume which is inspired, and which is so entirely. This assurance ought to suffice us. Three classes of persons in these last times, without disavowing the divine nature of Christianity, and without pretending to except against the authority of the Scriptures, have felt themselves at liberty to reject this doctrine. The first of these has disowned even the *existence* of this action of the Holy Spirit; the second has denied its *universality*; and the third its *plenitude* . . . . The third (as M. Twesen in Germany, and several English theologians)\* extends, it is true, the notion of a Theopneustia to all parts of the Bible, but not in equal degree to all, (nicht gleichmässig.) According to their view, inspiration would indeed be universal, but would be unequal, often imperfect, accompanied with harmless errors, and meted out according to the nature of the passages of which they constitute themselves more or less the judges. Several among them, especially in England, have gone so far as to specify four degrees of divine inspiration . . . . All these distinctions are, in our view, chimerical; the Bible itself does not authorize them; the church, during the first eight centuries of the Christian era, knew nothing of them; and we believe them to be erroneous and fraught with evil. Our design, in this treatise, as opposed to these three systems, is to prove the EXISTENCE, UNIVERSALITY, and PLENITUDE of Theopneustia.'— pp. 27—29.

We have not at the moment the opportunity of examining M. Twesen's work,† for the purpose of shewing how far his opinions deserve the censure passed on them in this passage. We shall merely say that M. Twesen is greatly esteemed, as associated with Tholuck, Hahn, and others, in effecting a most happy revolution on behalf of evangelical truth in the theological literature of Germany; though he is not entirely free from the speculative tendencies of the German mind, and of the schools in which he has been trained. His views of inspiration, however, are too evangelical and profound to be so summarily classed with the *opponents* of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. But of our own writers we will say, with M. GausSEN's permission, that they have taught an inspiration of the Scriptures as plenary as that for which he contends, and that in teaching it they display a calmness of thought, a sagacity of discrimination, and a strength of argument, which we are tempted to claim as the national characteristics of English theology on this as on every other question.

\* 'Drs. Pye Smith, Dick, and Wilson.'

† *Vorlesung über die Dogmatik.*

But let us turn to the great divines of Switzerland. M. GausSEN must be presumed to be familiar with the writings of Francis Turretin, since he adopts a citation from his 'Institutio Theologiae Elencticæ' as the motto of his title-page. Now Turretin expressly says, 'that Scripture proves itself to be divine, not only by an authoritative appeal to testimony,—which, however successfully it may be used in reasoning with Christians who profess to receive the Scriptures, cannot be urged against those who reject them,—but also by reasonings founded on the indubitable proofs of divinity which God has impressed on the Scriptures as on all his works . . . . But,' he afterwards adds, 'it must not be supposed that these tokens of divinity shine forth *alike and in the same degree* in all the books of Scripture; for as one star differs from another star in brightness, so some books emit fuller and more dazzling rays of light, and others fewer and feebler, according as they are more or less necessary to the church, and contain doctrines of more or less moment: so that the gospels and the Pauline epistles glow with far richer splendour than the book of Ruth or of Esther,' &c.\*

Another celebrated Swiss divine, Joh. Frid. Stapfer, admonishes his readers that they must 'distinguish the things written in the Scriptures by *immediate* inspiration of the Holy Spirit from those which are committed to writing only by the *direction* of the Holy Spirit: to the former class belong all the peculiar doctrines of salvation, which, as they could not be discovered by the principles of reason, could not be made known but by revelation; to the latter class belong all those truths which, though previously known, required to be inculcated on man, both to arouse him to a sense of his duty and to convince him of his need of a revealed salvation; the same class also includes the historical facts connected with the illustration and proof of revealed doctrines, and pointing out the various steps of revelation, in the bestowments of grace, and in the ministrations of the church, all of which require to be known, for the fuller explanation of divine truth.'†

A third divine of Switzerland, B. Pictet, suggests, as a caution lest we should be deceived in the matter of the inspiration of the sacred books, 'Il n'est pas nécessaire de supposer que l'Esprit de Dieu a toujours dicté aux prophètes et aux apôtres tous les mots dont ils se sont servis, et qu'il leur a appris tout ce qu'ils écriroient. Il suffit qu'ils n'ont rien écrit, que par la direction immédiate de l'Esprit de Dieu, en sorte que cet Esprit n'a jamais permis, qu'ils aient erre dans ce qu'ils ont écrit. *Agobard,*

\* Institutio Theologiae Elencticæ, loc. ii. quæs. iv.

† Inst. Theol. Pol., tom. ii. p. 859. See also tom. iii. 269.

uteur du ix siècle, dans sa reponse à Frédigise, dit, que *c'est une absurdité de croire que le Saint Esprit ait inspiré les termes et les mots . . . . Cependant c'étoit l'Esprit qui les empêchoit de tomber dans aucune erreur, non pas même dans les moindres choses.*\*

Our object in making these citations is merely to shew that the ablest defenders of the inspiration of Scripture in *Switzerland* agree with the evangelical doctors of *Germany*, and especially of *England*, in maintaining the views which M. GausSEN professes to oppose, and which he, apparently, confounds with other views on this subject from which they are not less distant than himself. We make no apology for entering on this topic: we have deemed it an act of critical duty, both to our readers and to a class of writers by whom we are laid under deep obligations for their luminous exposition of a doctrine so fundamental to our faith.

Let us now pass on to the kinds of proof by which the doctrine of inspiration is supported. As the main design of M. GausSEN's volume is to impugn some opinions of those who acknowledge the inspiration of the Scriptures, it was scarcely to be expected, perhaps, that the proofs would receive the careful attention which we should otherwise have looked for in a treatise on the Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures. His method is to shew—

'*First*, that all Scripture is Theopneustic; *secondly*, that all prophetic words are given from God; *thirdly*, that all the Scriptures of the Old Testament are prophetic; *fourthly*, that all the Scriptures of the New Testament are prophetic; and *fifthly*, that the example of the apostles and of their Master attests, that in their estimation, all the words of the Holy Books are given by God.'—Chap. vi. pp. 370—431.

It strikes us that ingenious as this plan is,—and acceptable as it will be, on the whole, to readers who, like ourselves, are already satisfied on this subject,—it is one which, we fear, will fail to clear the doubts of the sceptical, to solve the difficulties of humble inquirers, or to refute the objections of those by whom the doctrine is denied.

The *first* proof is, in fact, a mere statement of the thing to be proved. It is, indeed, a statement made by an apostle. But the limits of the statement are not defined; the amount of its meaning is not decided; and no principles either of interpretation or of theological reasoning are suggested, as they might have been with great advantage, for shewing the bearing of this explicit declaration on the writings of the New Testament. From the wording of his *second* proof, 'that all prophetic words are given by God,' we are bound in fairness to observe that there is to us an appearance of *équivoque* in the structure of the

† *La Théologie Chrétienne*, tom. prem. l. i. c. xvi.

argument. ‘*Prophetic words*’ are at once supposed to mean *words which foretel future events*; and most of the passages quoted by M. GausSEN are of this description. But he avails himself of the well-known comprehensive meaning of the word ‘*prophecy*,’ as used in Scripture, to define its *generic* signification as ‘*words of God put into the mouths of men*.’ We object to the definition as an assumption, as too limited and artificial: but waiving this, it appears to us that the author’s theory of uniform verbal inspiration has tempted him to a mode of reasoning which is more clever than convincing, imposing, but not solid. This will be seen more plainly by following him to his *next* proposition, ‘All the Scriptures of the Old Testament are prophetical.’—That all Scripture of the Old Testament is prophetical in that sense in which a large portion of it is prophetical would not, of course, be pretended; but neither can it be maintained that all Scripture of the Old Testament consists of ‘*words of God put into the mouths of men*.’ This is what we mean by the appearance of *équivoque*. It may be true—we believe it is true—that the Scriptures of the Old Testament are prophetical, for they have all been given to us by the direction of the Holy Spirit; but it is not true,—that is, we are neither taught in Scripture, nor, in our judgment, warranted to conclude from what it does teach—that all Scripture consists of ‘*the words of God put into the mouths of men*.’

When the author announces as his *fourth* proposition ‘that all the Scriptures of the New Testament are prophetical,’ he seems not to have weighed the import of what he says in the first sentence:—‘Scripture invariably places the *writers* of the New Testament in the same rank with the prophets of the Old.’ This language plainly implies that the writers of the New Testament are very often mentioned in Scripture—mentioned as *writers*—(for the argument, let it be observed, is most anxiously confined by M. GausSEN to *inspired writings*)—mentioned as the writings of the prophets who wrote the Old Testament are mentioned. This certainly is not the fact. It is true that Peter classes the Epistles of Paul with ‘*the other Scriptures*,’ and himself with ‘*the holy prophets*.’ It is also true that the mission of the apostles, the promises made to them, the gifts conferred on them, and the rank assigned to them, prove them to be superior to the prophets of the former dispensation. But M. GausSEN has not quoted one simple direct averment of the inspiration of the *whole New Testament* at all resembling the quoted averments of the inspiration of the entire Old Testament. He has indeed surprised us by the following assertion:—

‘It is, therefore, with the consent, and under the prophetic rule of these apostles, authorized to bind and loose, and to be, after Christ, the

twelve foundations of the universal church, that the canon of the Scriptures has been formed; and it is from them that the new people of God have received the 'living oracles' to transmit them to us.'—p. 407.

In what *passage of the New Testament* are we told that the canon of the Scriptures was thus formed?—The *last* argument is, 'That the example of the apostles and of their Master attests that, in their estimation, all the words of the holy books are given by God.' We entertain no doubt whatever that the '*inspiration*' of the holy books forming the Old Testament is attested by the manner in which they are referred to as a whole, and cited in numberless passages, both by the apostles and by their Master. But their references and citations do not prove that all the words were given in the unvaried style of dictation, which is held forth in this volume as being of the essence of the Theopneustia; nor does their example give one direct assertion of the inspiration of the *whole* New Testament.

Holding, as we do, the plenary inspiration of the holy Scriptures, we shall briefly point out some of those facts, in the comparison of which this doctrine is fully and rationally proved.

Jesus Christ was 'a teacher sent from God.' This Divine Teacher having promised to certain disciples that they should receive the Holy Ghost, to qualify them as his witnesses, and as the teachers of his truth to all nations, they, on the ground of his repeated promise, claimed divine authority for their oral and written instructions; and the validity of their claim was sustained by their miracles, by their character, and by the wisdom of their doctrine. In all their writings, veracity, fidelity, accuracy, are professed, and professed, obviously, because they were conscious of writing under the guidance of the promised Spirit, whose peculiar presence with them was constantly declared by their miracles. Again;—the references in the epistles to the facts of our Saviour's history are so made, as designedly to authenticate the gospels; and the writers of these gospels give their narrations with a *natural air of certainty* which wise and holy men would not—and which everything in their character, history, and writings demonstrates they did not—groundlessly assume. All the arguments, therefore, which prove that the books of the New Testament are historically true, go to prove that they were given by the inspiration of that Spirit which had been promised to the writers.

The supposed distinction between the writings of Mark or Luke, and those of the other New Testament writers, is of no importance in this question; for these histories are as authentic as any other parts of Scripture, and they contain the same internal marks of inspiration. That the writers were not apostles did not disqualify them for being inspired historians; while their

association with the apostles is a strong presumption that they were partakers of the *χαρισματα*—the prophetic spirit, so largely bestowed in the apostolic age; and there are internal as well as historical evidences that their narratives received the sanction of Peter and Paul.

The reverence displayed by the apostles for the sacred writings of the Old Testament was such that they would have been restrained by piety, honesty, and good sense, from placing their own writings on a level with them, without being assured that the same divine inspiration was common to them all. The comparison of any part of the New Testament with other writings of the same age, nation, or language,—with Josephus, for example, or Philo, or Hermas, or Clement, or any of the Rabbins,—will easily convince the reader of the immeasurable superiority of the former, which superiority is accounted for by their inspiration, and in no other way.

The reception of these writings as inspired,\* by the early Christian churches, is a proof that they were so regarded by the persons best qualified to judge. It is a great mistake to suppose that the decree of the Council of Laodicea, or of any other body, *constituted* the canonicity of the particular books of the New Testament. These decisions resulted from the previous judgment of *separate churches*, which had learned from the apostles in what light these books were to be regarded. The hesitation of some churches to receive some books is a sufficient proof of their scrupulous caution in so sacred an affair; while the reception of *each*, by one church or another, is a satisfactory exhibition of the well-defined grounds on which they were all eventually acknowledged to be inspired by all the churches.

Freely as we have animadverted on M. Gaußen's adopted theory, on his indiscriminate censure of all who differ from him, and on some of the imperfections of his reasoning,—and repudiating as we do a certain vein of imaginative sentiment, which, we confess, is not exactly to our taste, in a disquisition on so profound a question,—we do not the less readily hail him as a fellow-labourer in the great field of European evangelization. We have been much edified by his glowing appeals to the believing heart. We go entirely with him in his reverential homage to the authority of Scripture. We should be glad to see his volume, somewhat modified and abridged, take its place with his friend D'Aubigné's 'Histoire de la Reformation,' among the popular translations of the day. We

\* Τὰς γραφὰς ἀληθεῖς ρήσεις Πιεύματος τοῦ Ἀγίου.—Clem. ad Cor. Ep. I. ME.  
Οὗτος ἀφενός σπατος  
κανῶν αν εἰή των θεόπνευστῶν γραφῶν.—Greg. Naz. Op., Tom. i.  
Πᾶσα γραφὴ ἡμῶν Χριστιανῶν θεόπνευστος εστιν.—Athan. Syn. Scrip.  
Πιστευθεντα τε θεῖα ειναι βιβλια,—Athan. Ep. ad Ruf.

strongly recommend the study of it to those who are tempted by the freedom of German rationalism, and to those, also, who are fettered by the *servitude* which is so widely spreading through the land under the high pretensions of Anglican theology.

We shall not be suspected of a wish to underrate sacred criticism. Our pages uniformly testify our ardent desire for its more perfect cultivation, not only by professed theologians, but by all educated persons. We affect no sympathy with the undiscerning English prejudice against all German writers on these subjects, nor with the blindfold accusations of neology against all who apply to the language of Scripture the only principles by which language can at all be expounded. Yet we must conscientiously record our protest—whatever be its weight—against the dreamy philosophy, the unsound principles, the shallow reasoning, the overloaded, ostentatious, and perverted scholarship, and the irreverent levity, with which so many German theologues have violated every law of evidence, while they wound and shock every sentiment of religion.

On the other hand, we have no aversion to 'the Fathers.' We owe to them some of our brightest, and not a few of our *saddest*, hours of leisure. We are ready to contribute any little influence we have towards a just appreciation of them. But we are at a loss for language strong enough to express our resentment of the audacious impiety that would place them on a level with the inspired writings, or our pity for the drivelling superstition that would submit to them as expounders from whom there must be no appeal.

For these reasons, we bid most hearty welcome to every enlightened attempt to arouse the thoughtful among us to **THE PECULIAR GLORY OF THE SCRIPTURES**. Since these holy writings are inspired of God, to them we are required to bow, and to them only, as the authorized instructions of the gospel, so that every controversy in religion shall be determined, every principle adjusted, and every preconception overruled, by their faithfully-expounded meaning. With all diligence, let that meaning be sought; let Criticism bring all her lights to guide us to the text; let Hermeneutics apply the principles of language to enable us to understand that text; let the judgments of all writers, of all ages, from the Roman Clement to this day, be freely handled, and learnedly examined, to rectify, if it may be, the vague mistakes of popular tradition, or to explode the cramped interpretations of dogmatic theologians. But, with all this, and above all, let the spirit of unfeigned and disciplined humility pour out the fervent prayer for 'the wisdom which is from above.' It is only thus, in the patient and devout use of all these means, that the minds of men will be led into 'the mind of the Spirit,' and all the truth

of God will be the entire creed of the whole church. Happy and honoured in our esteem is he who, like M. Gaussem, consecrates his genius, casting his living seed upon the stream of time, to the hastening on of so blessed a consummation. To that consummation, we soberly believe, all the great controversies of this disputing age are tending. We would abide its coming, holding our convictions earnestly, and desiring, as becomes Christian believers, to unite the docility of children with the intelligence of men and the constancy of martyrs.

---

Art. II. *Notes of a Traveller on the Social and Political State of France, Prussia, Switzerland, Italy, and other parts of Europe, during the present Century.* By Samuel Laing, Esq. London: Longman and Co. 1842. pp. 496.

THE author of this interesting volume has already earned an ample reputation for sagacity and discernment. He may almost be said to have founded a new and improved school of travellers, who, like himself, will roam up and down Europe, with a crucible in one hand, and a portable furnace in the other. Our tourists have been hitherto accustomed to content themselves with the outsides of things; and the all-prolific press still teems with deluges of pencillings by the way, and first impressions. But those who go abroad henceforward, with an honest view either to improve themselves, or benefit others, must become more and more utilitarians. Not that they need adopt philosophical airs, or the jargon of Jeremy Bentham; but they must search as well as see; they must analyze as well as describe; they must store their journals with ideas as well as pretty writing: in other words, if they wish to be read, they must give out knowledge, and that, too, in as intelligent a manner as possible. *Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci.* This will have to be their motto and rationale. The volumes published by Mr. Laing, on Norway and Sweden, have effected positive good for Europe. In the former he unveiled, what had remained almost unknown, the liberal constitution of a million of mountaineers, thinly scattered over cold but interesting regions, from the Sound to the Icy Seas: in the latter, he has instructed the successors of Gustavus Adolphus and Charles the Twelfth, that aristocratic influences and institutions are amongst the most demoralizing in the world; and that privileged governing classes are so many patented nuisances. Much patriotic indignation having been displayed by his excellency Count Biörnstierna, the Swedish minister in London, at a vast quantity of plain truth being told relative to his own government and country, diplomatic magnates are now

turning their eyes towards the light—some with surprise, and others with indignation. The successful and ingenious writer, who has accomplished such a good work with regard to the Scandinavian peninsula, appears once more before the public, with the results of his observation upon several of the central and southern climes of our quarter of the globe. ‘Taking historical events, statistical facts, and his own remarks in various tours, as a basis, he proceeds from that basis straightforward to his conclusions in political or social economy, regardless of the theories, authorities, or opinions that may be jostled out of the road; or of the establishments, classes, or personages, whose assumed merits, or false lustre, may be rubbed off in the collision and shock with truth and just principle.’

The curtain draws up over the land of cheese and butter, wide trowsers and enormous petticoats—of fens, fogs, canals, and willow-trees: in one word—Holland. Its apparent flatness gives occasion to some just remarks upon the scale of the sublime, in any country, depending very much on the angle of its elevation. Our author threw across the seven dull Dutch provinces the glances of a practical philosopher, in passing not hastily through them. Their spires, bright farm-houses, and windows gleaming in the sunshine, (that is to say, whenever Phœbus has his own way,) at once attracted notice. It is curious enough, however, to observe how differently we are affected by expansion in the horizontal, and that in a perpendicular plane. Therein lies the distinction between the Netherlands and Switzerland; between Zealand or Overyssell, and Mont Blanc or Chimborazo. But if Holland may not boast of the grand, or more impressive picturesque, her foregrounds present plenty of snug, compact, harmonious home scenery, with everything within and without in character; besides abundance of historical and political associations. That ‘God made the country and man the town,’ is nowhere so perfectly illustrated. The Mynheers are great amateurs of the romantic and rural in nature. Their garden-houses are decorated with such titles as, ‘My Delight, my Sweet Solitude, or my Darling Felicity;’ and though these epithets are literally stuck up, in glittering letters of gilt or tin, upon the fronts of wooden boxes only twelve feet square, yet they record, after a Dutch fashion, that voice of truth, which comes up warm from the heart of man, and which all acknowledge, when Cowper, or any other poet like him, dwells upon the subject. Holland, moreover, constitutes the land of chivalry as to the middle classes! Burke may smile, or turn in his grave, if he pleases; yet the assertion just made is true. Grocers, fishcurers, and shipowners, raised their native sand-banks and marshes into a power, which pulled Spain by the beard, and shewed the haughty

nobles of absolute monarchies what freedom and commerce could perform. Yet the curses of those aristocrats, who gnashed their teeth in vain three hundred years ago, seem at length to have fallen upon the deserted streets of Delft, Leyden, and Haerlem. Their greatness, in fact, was founded upon commercial prosperity and capital, rather than upon productive industry. Holland became proud and opulent as a broker between nation and nation. There existed no mass of native population, through which wealth might circulate, so as to reproduce that which ministers to human wants and gratifications. Markets may be established anywhere, but not manufactures. These last depend upon soil, locality, and natural circumstances. 'Human character, also, in the large, is formed by human employment, and is only removable with it. The busy, active, industrious spirit of a population, trained to quick work, and the energetic exertion of every power in the competition of a manufacturing country, is an unchangeable moral element in its national prosperity, founded upon productive industry.' The lower classes in the Seven United Provinces very slightly participated in the golden tide of trade, which set into the Zuyder Zee, during the sixteenth and the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Merchants grew into princes, without their boors or peasants emancipating themselves from slavery or serfdom. Hence the principle of exclusiveness remained as a dry-rot in their social system. Dutch capital is found everywhere; but Dutch prosperity, in the national sense, has dwindled into a dream or a recollection. *Fuit Ilium et ingens gloria!* The quays and canals of Amsterdam and Rotterdam still swarm with portly proprietors and starving paupers. The colonies formed for the benefit of the last, appear not altogether to have answered their purpose; nor yet to have quite failed. They have, perhaps, sympathized not a little with their founder and patron, his majesty William the First. Royalty is not popular, even at the Hague. Its *prestige* seemed wanting amidst a people habituated to take tradesmanlike views of everything. The ex-king aggravated this evil, if it be one, by acting as a sovereign amongst traders, and a trader amongst sovereigns. He fell upon his subjects, also, like the log in the fable, thrown out of heaven by Jupiter, to be lord and governor to a pond of croakers. He landed at Schevening, in 1813, with his portmanteau, and a bunch of orange ribbands at his breast; and retired from business in 1841, the richest individual in Europe, worth, it is said, above 20,000,000*l.* sterling! Contempt and envy are, therefore, the eggs he has left behind him, which may produce an awkward brood to his family in future. It is justly conceived, that they ought to play the part and pageantry of a crown for little or

nothing, upon a stage where their own coffers have grown full, and those of the public exchequer empty. Taxation, it is clear, cannot be pushed further than within about five-sevenths of the expenditure. At no distant day a composition will have to be made between Holland and her creditors. Common people must then be plucked and peeled; whilst the royal gander may probably waddle away without the requisition of a quill or a guilder to disturb his self-complacency. There can be neither love nor respect under such circumstances:

*'Sordidus ac dives, populi contemnere voces  
Sic solitus. Populus me sibilat: at mihi plundo  
Ipse domi, simul ac nummos contemplor in arcâ!'*

Mr. Laing supposes that Belgium and Holland will have to come together again, under a federal union: the second possessing capital and colonies, and the first manufacturing industry, with many productive capabilities, but without outlets or markets. Should the two states remain too long separate, the provinces of Belgium bid fair to be absorbed by France, and those of Holland either by Prussia, or the German commercial league.

Travellers generally pass from Brussels to Paris; along which road there is much to observe, but little to describe. The landscape is a wearisome expanse of tillage land, without hills or valleys, lakes or streams. 'La Belle France is in truth a Calmuck beauty; her flat pancake of a face, destitute of feature, projection, or dimple, and not being even tattooed with lines and cross-lines of hedges, walls, and ditches.' We need not say that this by no means applies to all departments; but few things have more interested us than the ingenious account Mr. Laing favours us with, touching the origin of that green network of hedgerows, which spreads so smilingly over the fairer surface of our own country. He justly conceives that it must have been the work of a nation of small proprietors, long employed upon the cultivation of their own fields, at some part of the period between the withdrawal of the Romans and the Norman Conquest. Our author sees and feels eye to eye with ourselves, as to the mischiefs of aristocracy, and the hereditary principle of primogeniture. He scatters to the four winds of heaven all the dolorous predictions of Arthur Young, the Edinburgh Reviewers, poor Cobbett, and Doctor Chalmers. The last comes under his lash most severely, for his well-known doctrines as a political economist; nor can anything by the pen of man, as it appears to us, be made plainer, than that feudalism, in all its ramifications, is at once unnatural and highly injurious to mankind; whilst the new system of property, which has been now working for half a century amongst our continental neighbours, has enabled the same

territorial surface to support a population in considerable affluence, greater by one-third in numbers than that which just contrived to keep soul and body together upon it, before the mighty changes of the Revolution ! The partition and re-partition of land has not reduced all estates to one minimum size, like the acre of the Irish cottier. Properties of all sizes and values, from 500*l.* to 50,000*l.* in price, are to be found on sale in France, exactly as in England, allowing for the less amount of wealth and capital. Aggregations by deaths of co-relatives fully balance the subdivisions incident upon the deaths of parents ; so far, we mean, as to the production of results unsuitable to the welfare of society at large. That the aristocracy of France did not receive their death-warrant, when their entails and exclusive privileges disappeared before the breath of a national convention, we are far from affirming : but what we insist upon is this, that France has gained largely by the new plan. A system of small proprietorships wears a very different aspect from one of small tenancies. The latter is Ireland, with her paupers and potatoes ; the former is France, with industry on the move, with her good substantial houses building in every village, with her minor landowners locating themselves on their estates as so many multiplied centres of domestic civilization, with her middle classes rising rapidly into notice and influence, with her rivers covered with steam-boats, and her exports as well as imports augmenting. Much, indeed, remains to be done ; for although the French have obtained political freedom, they are not as yet in the full enjoyment of civil liberty. The old law of succession, with respect to freehold property was with them what it still is to us, the grand pillar of the oligarchy. Upon it rested all the arrangements of the ancient régime ; an old court, an established clergy, a profligate nobility, all now prostrated in the dust, to be the materials of better institutions, under which millions are to be fed and clothed and educated, where only myriads or thousands were before. Meanwhile property diffused has necessarily introduced much greater respect than ever existed before, for what constitutes the *meum* and *tuum* of individuals, or society. Our limits will not permit us to quote the ample proofs of this, which met our author at every turn ; and to the correctness of which every one else can depose, who has ever strolled throughout the gay vineyards of Burgundy, Languedoc, or Provence, apart from the fashionable routes, where the airs of our vagrant conservatives have rendered our national name as odious, as the taxes levied upon it by innkeepers and couriers are vexatious and extravagant.

The people of France, we repeat it, have yet more than enough to learn ; and they had much better mind their lesson too, than ruffle their spirits with needless jealousies of England, or waste

them in golden and deceitful speculations about Algeria ever becoming to them a sort of small Hindostan. They, as well as several other European nations, have nearly got rid of their aristocracy ; although every now and then the Chamber of Peers plays sad pranks against the press, at the command of Louis Philippe. But a far more important feature of the case is, that functionarism has grown up into an enormous altitude, upon the ruins of antiquated castles, rusty coronets, obsolete usages now found only in the saloons of the old noblesse, and the other innumerable concomitants of feudalism. 'The abolition of hereditary aristocracy, as an influential power in the social structure, threw each successive government, under whatever name, republican, consular, imperial, or monarchical, upon one principle for support, the influence of an extensive government patronage.' Similar causes have produced similar effects in Germany ; and it may be considered, that the mechanisation of all social duties in the hands of the executive forms a demoralizing element, unfavourable most certainly to the development of industry, free agency, or public spirit. Continental governments, in fact, plague or annoy their subjects, as it were, at almost every turn. They mount guard at the steps of the doorway ; they stop the diligences at the barrier, or the single traveller, whenever any communal officer pleases, for their or his passport ; they pry into all concerns, from honest, generally, but always from most inconvenient motives ; and the care taken by the crown of its people approaches too nearly to that exercised by a bailiff towards his prisoner, who must never be let go out of sight. To an Englishman this would be intolerable ; but then it must be remembered, that we enjoy, what few of the continentals as yet know much about, civil liberty. In France there are one hundred and thirty-eight thousand civil appointments under government, costing annually two hundred millions of francs ; or about eight millions sterling ! But this statement gives only an inadequate view of the nuisance. There is one functionary family for every forty-six families of the people ; so that all this subsistence in the field of government employment too often paralyses exertion in the various spheres of private industry. The analogy holds good between families and collections of families. Where parents do everything for their children, the latter will very rarely do more than the least they possibly can do for themselves. Functionarism attracts towards itself nearly all the mind, industry, and capital, of the secondary classes, on which the wealth and prosperity of a nation are founded. Hence patronage comes to be worshipped, like an idol, by those who have been educated and trained to expect its favours. The hand of the minister at Paris may hold the stirrup of a royal horse for his

majesty to mount upon, but he holds the bridle also, even after the king has mounted. An army of clerks, secretaries, and scribes of every denomination, waits upon the beck and call of each transitory cabinet; so that the entire machinery, under which millions of Frenchmen eat, drink, sleep, read newspapers, discuss politics, or in one word live, move, and have their being, might all be thrown into inextricable confusion, through any rebellion of the bureaucracy. It is further to be observed, that in time of peace, the military service in most foreign countries differs little from the civil. Having few or no colonies to garrison, and slight rotation at home from one quarter or province to another, the military, from their being generally stationed for many years together in the same towns, at length act upon general industry or manners, much in the same way, and with the same effects, as the body of civil functionaries. 'Both together form a mass of subsistence, influence, and distinction, to be attained by other means than productive industry, and which smothers all exertion, or spirit of independence, in the industrious classes.' Our author even goes so far as to conceive that functionarism, as a colossal evil, may be effecting all the disadvantages and social detriment which flowed, during mediaeval and modern times, from the feudal and monastic systems. Here we cannot agree with him; although admitting, from ocular and personal experience, that the outlines of his statement are most ably drawn. He seems, however, to have overlooked the fact, that an object very close to the eye must always appear greater than another further off, whether in prospect or retrospect. Functionarism, doubtless, inflicts many inconveniences upon society, which can be traced home peculiarly to itself; but then, after all, it is made up of popular materials; it admits of flexure and elasticity, and can be even forced to assume new or necessary forms, whenever public opinion shall demand it; the power it exercises reposes upon the admitted principles of responsibility; and should it ever act the tyrant beyond a certain point, we shall find it vanishing away at the very sentence of its condemnation, just as the castles of enchantment were feigned to disappear when the fatal trumpet was blown by the right heroes. The glory of the present age is, that knowledge rapidly disseminating itself amongst large masses of men—not ignorance, not superstition, not an ecclesiastical hierarchy, not an order of mailed barons—constitutes real, genuine, practical power. To uproot an aristocracy shakes the social earth to its centre. Its fibres have wound and threaded their way into the hearts and constitutions of a class resting upon the almost immovable rock of landed property. Its mind, language, motives, maxims, and universal conduct, affect thrones, dominions, palaces, marriages, the female sex, the revenues of

principalities, the habits of centuries. When it expires in these islands, it will be like Samson bringing down upon his head the chambers of the lords of the Philistines. The foundations of functionarism we hold to be altogether of another kind. Desolation, should that ever be its appointed destiny, might drive her plough over the length and breadth of its field, without any one asking or caring when it existed, or where it arose.

Nor even where the old mossgrown shell and framework of oligarchies have been overthrown or dismantled, are the associations all gone. Not even mind itself can annihilate mind; and the feudal spirit still lingers far too often among regenerated governments and populations. Property, delivered from its aristocratical fetters, will prove, according to Mr. Laing, the mighty liberator from despotism and prejudices, the grand check upon indiscreet marriage and propagation, the mighty patron of popular rights and social prosperity against monopoly and class legislation. Revolutions on the Continent have widely diffused it, together with those various yet useful ideas inseparable from successful industry when tasting the sweets of possession. Connected with this state of affairs must inevitably follow, in due time, an elevation of the social level, the free agency of individuals, the claims of every citizen to representation, the engendering, enlightening, and strengthening of that *vox populi*, which will teach governors to govern for the benefit of an entire community. Hence two distinct powers in society are at present advancing towards a collision, throughout France, Prussia, and Northern Germany—the power of property and royal power. The events of 1789-93 commenced a movement in Europe, of which the smallest portion, in the way of realized results, has as yet appeared. They broke up the continental populations into two strongly marked and distinct divisions. Austria, at the head of one, leads forward, or, rather, tries in vain to keep backward, the millions still living upon an aristocratic basis of government under the shadow of regal authority. There we see imperialism reposing on feudalism. The other division comprises those nations which have knocked aside primogeniture and hereditary privilege; and with whom a kingly executive has only the temporary pedestal of functionarism for its support. France professes herself to be the European foundress and leader of this novel social economy; but Prussia voluntarily entered within its circle, under Prince Hardenburg, in the year 1809. That great statesman changed the subjects of his master from tenants into proprietors, by a series of admirable edicts extending as low down as June, 1821. Upon a scheme of thorough utilitarianism, recognising the principles of adjustment and compensation, he defrauded no one, whilst conferring immense benefits

upon all. ‘It gave comfort and property to a population of serfs; it emancipated them from local oppression, raised their moral and physical condition, and gave them a political, although as yet unacknowledged, existence, as the most important constituent element of the social body. But here the Prussian revolution has stopped short of the French. It gave no political liberty, or influence, under any form; no representative constitution to those to whom it had given clear and distinct property; and, consequently, the feelings and requirements which the possession of property brings along with it. The people hold the property; and the crown, by its system of functionarism and its military organization, endeavours to hold all the rights and prerogatives belonging to, and morally and civilly essential to, property, even all the civil and political liberties of the proprietors of the country.’ Such circumstances of antagonism can never avoid concussion for any length of time. In France, the body of proprietors have obtained a portion at least of political liberty, yet without acquiring civil freedom. Prussia stands in the absurd position of clinging fast to absolutism, after necessity has compelled her to resign all lot and participation in feudalism. In plain terms, she is leaning upon mere functionarism to save herself, if she can, from being hurried along with the stream of general improvement. Her government, at all events, is doing this; and with what success may be easily foreseen. The chariot of reform was never made to roll backward, any more than a river of water, or the tide of years. Both Frederick William and Louis Philippe may endeavour to reconstruct landed and privileged aristocracies, or hierarchies in established churches, if they please; whilst time will soon teach them, as it has done their predecessors, that to weave ropes out of sand along the sea-shore, would be about as profitable a manufacture.

The Prussians call themselves a nation without traditions; and possibly this may explain some of the very exaggerated notions as to the real grandeur of their favourite, Frederick the Great. Their past history must be a collection of annals independent of each other, connected respectively with margravates, electorships, and dukedoms, all on a petty scale; affording little or no space for mighty heroes to stalk up and down in; and thereby give scope for comparison—

*Νεστορα τε, χρονιον τε, Περικλυμενον τ' αγερωχον!*

In ordinary parlance, therefore, Prussia, as a name, possesses only a geographical or political meaning. Her existence has been moulded and maintained by diplomacy. Cabinets have suffered her to make large territorial acquisitions, looking upon her as an immense military organization. Yet it is sufficiently

clear, that standing armies, employed as mere machines, have no chance with troops coming against them excited and animated with heart-stirring sentiments or motives. The war, from 1794 to 1814, broke up the antiquated games so often indulged in by continental potentates, of playing chess with soldiers; and demonstrated, that where moral influences have kindled national fervour, no people can be subdued. 'The alteration, in Prussia, of the law and holding of landed property, and the subversion of the ancient feudal relations between the peasant and the nobility,—a change almost as great in the state of property, and altogether as great in the structure of society, as the revolution produced in France; the new military system, by which the people themselves became the only standing army; the new educational system, by which government has in its own hands the training of the mind and opinions of the public, through its own functionaries; the new ecclesiastical system, by which the two branches of the Protestant church, the Lutheran and Calvinist, are joined together and blended into one different from both—the Prussian church; the German custom-house union, or commercial league, centralising in Prussia the management of the commercial and manufacturing industry connected with the supply of other German populations, and raising a Prussian dominancy over the industrial pursuits of the rest of Germany; all these are so many steps towards the one great object of imbuing the Prussians with those moral influences, without which a population is not a nation, and on which their genuine greatness, and independence, and even their existence, must ultimately depend.' The Prussian military system forms one of the most important features in the social economy of the continent. It has been imitated or adopted by all the secondary European powers. Every male subject between the ages of twenty and twenty-five years, without distinction of fortune, birth, class, or intended profession, is bound to serve as a private soldier in the ranks, for a period of three successive years. Even those persons intended for the catholic priesthood are not exempted; although as a matter of extreme favour the term, in certain instances, becomes limited to twelve months. After such service, in a regiment of the line, the individual returns to his home on leave of absence, as a supernumerary, liable to be called out in case of war, until the attainment of his twenty-sixth year; after which, he is drafted into the army of reserve, which has to assemble for exercise and field manœuvres for a fortnight always, and often a month annually. At fifty, a man passes into what is styled the land-sturm, or levy-en-masse; and which musters for so many days, in its own locality alone. But the result just goes towards rendering the whole land a camp, and the entire adult population an army!

Its apparent cheapness, in proportion to its enormous numerical strength, no doubt impresses an observer at the first sight of the affair; until he has reflected, that its cost is by no means confined to the pecuniary expenditure. In reality, this militia is a most cruel pressure upon national industry, a reckless waste of the time, and an inhuman interference with the moral habits of any enlightened or highly civilized community. The operative has the three most valuable years of his life taken from him, just when he might be best acquiring steady habits at his work, or manual dexterity at his trade; besides his fortnight, or month per annum in some battalion of reserve, subtracted from the most profitable season in the year, and connected with all the inconveniences of going from home, amidst the temptations of evil companions, or the excitements of the barrack. Our author calculates it as equivalent to a property-tax of ten per cent. upon the labour of the productive classes. Hence the low state of so many of the manufactures in Germany; whose middle classes are formed, under this hateful system of annual drills and parades, not by the rise of individuals, from those below themselves, as with us in England and Scotland, but from the gradual breaking down of the orders above them. The military organization of a whole people, after this fashion, sacrifices their civil freedom; neutralizes their prospect of obtaining political liberty; and, in one significant phrase, ‘pays for the saddle without leaving a thaler to buy the horse!’ It must also be remembered, that, for any offensive operations, such a machine must be effete and useless. It is neither moveable, nor disposable; as was shewn in the rather recent dismemberment of the Netherlands. Even in a defensive sense, it would be fighting against an invader with golden and silver swords. The loss of a battle would be greater to Prussia, in a political and economical view, than three or four defeats of ordinary troops. Social affairs would be more deranged; more useful life would be destroyed. Her present army involves too much intelligence, property, influence,—too many fathers, husbands, and sons of the worthiest families throughout her ten provinces, to be placed in jeopardy. If the horrible science and profession of warfare may not as yet be dispensed with, at least let them be exercised *in vili corpore*, as much as possible. Unless the next struggle in Europe be for national existence, Prussia will no longer remain amongst the five great powers. England, France, Russia, and Austria, may use to their mercenary forces the language of the centurion. The court of Berlin will regret all the millions which have been lavished upon annual reviews, should Louis Philippe, or his successors, ever think of realizing the speculations of Thiers, and rounding their dominions by the Rhine!

Meanwhile the German Commercial League is kneading together from twenty to thirty millions of people, for purposes which its projectors little intended. His late Majesty, Frederick William, never conceived an idea but that Prussia, through her Silesian and Saxon territories, with her hands too on the Baltic and the Rhenish electorates, would effectually control the movement for her own peculiar advantage. Love is represented by the ancients as being blindfolded, but self-love or selfishness would often seem to have no eyes at all. The enthusiasm of Germany has turned from the broken promises of restored sovereigns, to something like a disposition for trusting in future to its own efforts. The ball, which royal policy has for years taken infinite pains to increase from a small nucleus, now begins to roll of itself, to exhibit symptoms of governing or wishing to govern itself. How careful should autocrats be in ever meddling with federations, or encouraging the middle or lower classes to put two ideas together. A mighty object of material interest now stands out before the public mind from Pomerania to Austria. Within the present generation, on the Rhine alone, goods had to pass through twenty-seven different custom-houses, in their transit from Switzerland to Holland. Prussia, however, is already said to be a loser, as to mere commercial revenue, of 500,000 dollars per annum, through what are justly termed recent improvements by almost all Germany. Some of the lesser states may be jealous of her appearing to take steps towards mediatising them; but on the whole, an outline has been laid down before the gaze and heart of Teutonic patriotism, within which, union of national mind, and strength of national purpose, may some day or other evoke the sun of liberty from behind the shadows of despotism. This will be indeed a *post nubila Phœbus*; but the will, the opinion, the determined judgment, and the effective capital of immense mercantile establishments, have already entered into the affairs and management of the League. Berlin has now to follow, instead of leading, with regard to Dutch and British alliances touching tariffs and tolls. In due course of time, a monetary influence will help materially to extinguish the military principles of autocracy and irresponsibility in governments. Wiser and better than the old Hans Towns, it must meanwhile look less to the results of foreign trade, and more to the formation of home markets for domestic consumption. It will be by raising the condition of the peasantry and lower orders generally, that the beneficial change for posterity can alone be achieved. The trammels of warlike preparations in peace, of the functionary system at all times, and in all places, are grievances not much longer to be endured. Yet these Germans are nevertheless a very peculiar people. The

staple of their literature is imitative, with a few well-known and pre-eminent exceptions. The subsequent description will, we think, gratify our readers:—

‘ Their great original authors, Goëthe, Schiller, or Richter, or our great authors, Shakspeare, Scott, and Byron, give the tunes which the crowd of German writers are whistling through the streets. This imitative turn, and the excess of literary production, influence even the material interests and character of the German people. In politics, in social economy, in religion, and perhaps even in morals and the regulation of conduct, principles and opinions seem to have no time to take root, and to influence the actual doings of men, for conviction is but loosely connected with action. The latter by no means follows the former, even when not drawn aside by prejudice, passion, or self-interest. All is speculation, not reality. Every German seems to have two worlds for himself—a world of idea, and a world of reality; and the former appears to have as little connection with the latter, as the evening of the monarch on the stage with the morning of the actor in his lodgings. This division of life into two distinct existences, this living in a world of reveries, this wide separation between ideas and realities, between thoughts and actions, common, perhaps, to all men of intellectual cultivation, is so widely diffused in Germany, that it sensibly influences its social economy. All evaporates in speculation. Books and theories, and principles, are published and read; and there the matter rests. A new set of books, theories, and principles are published, and overwhelm the first; but all this never goes beyond the world of idea, in which half their existence is passed. Improvement, reform, movement of any kind in social business or real life, either for the better or the worse, stand still, because real life is but half their existence. Leave them the other half, their ideal world to expatriate in—and that cannot be circumscribed by any kind of government—and they quietly put up with restrictions and burthens in real life, which in our social economy would not be endured. Energy of mind, and vigour of action, in the real affairs of ordinary life, are diluted and weakened by this life of dreamy speculation. We sometimes see individuals, amongst ourselves, novel-reading, romantic youths, forming a little world for themselves, from the shelves of the circulating library, and dreaming away life in it. The literature, scholarship, and wide diffusion of the culture of the imaginative faculty in Germany, are in this view actually detrimental to the social development of the German people, to their industry, material interests, and activity in ordinary affairs of a mechanical kind, and to their energy and interest in claiming and exercising civil liberty or free agency in real life.’—pp. 265, 266.

The subject of German literature stands connected with the Prussian educational system, which finds little favour in the eyes of our otherwise agreeable tourist. He admits the perfection of its machinery; whilst with almost caustic severity he reviews its results upon the moral, religious, and social condition of the

people. We were well aware, in part from personal observation, that every institution, from Stettin and Königsberg to Cologne and Coblenz, assumes something very like a regimental character; but many statements in the present volume have filled us with sorrow and dismay. They would go far, we fear, to shew that wherever state instruction, on a large or small scale, supersedes, in any considerable degree, parental tuition, (and the entire tendency of the Prussian system is to do so,) there demoralization ensues with regard to honesty, chastity, and truth. The finger of government meddling in all action and opinion, so as to control altogether individual judgment, may produce 'youths well educated, as it is called, because they can read, write, sing, are well-dressed, well-drilled, and able-bodied,' but whose self-respect amounts to little or nothing. Protestantism herself would appear to have been looked upon by Prussian monarchs and statesmen only as an engine, to be turned this way or that, according to the opinions entertained by rulers of the religious creeds which ought to be adopted by their subjects. In 1817, about eight millions, under the sceptre of Frederick William, professed Lutheranism or Calvinism in nearly equal proportions. By a proclamation of the royal will, dated the 27th of September in that year, both these professions were abolished with the same ease and quietude that an order of council would effect some lawful commercial purpose amongst ourselves; and out of their suppression was created by the same absolute will, if not wisdom, **ONE EVANGELICAL CHRISTIAN CONGREGATION**, to be thenceforward styled **THE PRUSSIAN CHURCH**! Directions with regard to the sacraments and clergy, together with an appropriate liturgy, were all ready cut and dried, and were enforced also. What would our Charles the First not have given, about two centuries ago, for such regal power, or such an obedient people as these submissive Protestant Prussians—all with arms in their hands—all able to read, and many with the Scriptures in their possession—but all cooled down 'to zero, or at least to the amalgamation point' in religion? The court and garrisons and army did exactly as they were bid. Questions which had agitated kingdoms, or thrown republics and free cities into convulsions, were now settled by a royal sign-manual. Out of 8950 Protestant congregations, 7750 neither peeped nor muttered. Verily a people in this state must have been ready for any revolution in ceremonial observances or doctrinal professions. The decrees of the Council of Trent gave sore throats to the Catholic divines of more than one papal country, before they could be swallowed at all; nor even to this hour are they thoroughly digested by those of the Gallican communion. The edictal law of a lay sovereign, issued from the

banks of the Spree, without any associations of history, theology, or antiquity, to lubricate or stretch the conscience, went down bodily, without producing a paroxysm, a twinge, or even a wry face, on the occasion. The Prussian government, however, not satisfied with this extraordinary degree of success, gave the reins to its unfortunate rage for centralising everything; and in aiming to render every trifling detail as uniform as possible, at length began to awaken a semblance of opposition. In 1822, some modest and respectful murmurs whispered disapprobation towards the new church agenda, through its being pushed too rapidly and too far. Frederick William shut his ears, and never could perceive any vestige of uprightness or sincerity in consciences that were not precisely squared to his own. Although neither a papist nor an episcopalian, the spirit of a tiara had settled upon his heart. He could not brook the slightest opposition or remonstrance on these most sacred and tender topics. The novel forms of service were introduced with armed force wherever necessary; all objections to them were crushed as treasonable or heretical; and on some poor villages in Silesia turning recusant, 'troops were quartered on the people, to be supported at their expense,' until perfect conformity assuaged the pious wrath of the modern Hildebrand. Six hundred individuals alone stood their ground for heaven by submitting to spoliation and exile. They found their way by Hamburg and Hull to America, 'the last of religious martyrs, it is to be hoped, whom the persecution of a despot will drive to her forests.' Our readers will altogether concur with Mr. Laing in his subsequent conclusions:—

'The supremacy of the civil power over the religious concerns of a people is clearly inconsistent with any sound and pure administration of the Christian religion in Protestant countries. Now there is but one remedy for this overwhelming evil, which has been growing to a head since the Reformation. It is to vest the church power in Protestant countries, neither in the civil power or government of the country, nor in an ecclesiastical power independent of the civil power or government, which would be a state within the state, incompatible with social movement, *but in the source of all power*—in the people. *It is in the voluntary system, in which neither state power nor church power can interfere with the religious convictions of men, that Protestant Christianity must ultimately find its true and permanent asylum.*'  
—p. 195.

But the moral, religious, and social effects of the Prussian educational system, are still further and more painfully illustrated by the cautious and careful account given us by our author of the Muckers—a fearful sect, prevalent in and about Königsberg, comprehending several individuals of high consideration in that

city, and spreading very extensively under the leadership of two established ministers of the gospel—or at least they are so termed. This hideous denomination combines lewdness with doctrinal profession, to such a degree that we forbear transferring any details to our pages. Socialism would seem comparatively virtuous alongside this revival of antiquated abominations, which paganism itself knew, in some of its adherents, how to abhor and deprecate. One turns away in disgust from such subjects to the management of the poor at Berlin, and the notions entertained by Mr. Laing upon the Corn Laws. Pauperism is said to be better treated in the Prussian capital than in any European city with a large population. Berlin, with 300,000 souls, has no poor-rates, no beggars, and no obtrusive visibility of policemen. Yet the arrangements for the care of the distressed are most efficient, both as to the reality of the relief dispensed and the suppression of mendicity, all maintained and carried on by the gratuitous services of the middle classes. The municipalities appoint directors of the poor, who, together with the clergy and a paid staff of medical men, form a commission, acting upon the district system, with infirmaries, workhouses, and dispensaries, under their immediate charge. Their funds are supplied from permanent endowments, from legacies, from payments by government for the correctional police, from charitable free contributions, from occasional donations on the part of the crown, and lastly, from the general chest of what we should call borough-taxation. Hence, it is true, these last become taxes for the destitute under another name; but then the moral effects on the recipients are very different. There is no settled fund, as amongst ourselves, amounting to millions per annum, on which the vicious, the idle, or the improvident, can calculate as their own by law. No relief is dispensed without strict investigation and permanent surveillance; nor can anything well exceed the economy in cost, when this is fairly compared with the satisfactory nature of the results to all parties. The donors are gratified, and the paupers are satisfied. Most cordially do we wish that Mr. Laing would just separate this portion of his work from the rest, elucidate it with any further details which he may think proper to afford, and publish it as a pamphlet, for the enlightenment of our senators in their discussions upon the Poor Law Reform. We are not quite so thoroughly at one with him with respect to the Corn Question. He seems to have pondered less accurately than might have been expected, the grand fact that a permanent demand for grain in this country may go far towards equalizing the prices of food on the continent with those in England, thereby taking away from foreign rivals the solitary advantage which they possess over our capitalists and manufac-

turers. Neither has his mind cleared itself from that singular delusion, that high or low wages depend upon high or low prices of wheat, instead of being mainly affected, as we venture to conceive they are, by demand and supply. Not that Mr. Laing professes himself any friend to the master grievance of our age; for, on the contrary, he deems that its abolition will produce most beneficial changes, physical, moral, and social, particularly in bringing about a natural equilibrium between all kinds of labour. He would moreover lay the axe to the root of tithe; which, as he accurately demonstrates, is the real, genuine mother of poor-rate. But he also imagines that husbandry will gradually come round to the metayer system, to a subdivision of large farms into small ones, and to a reduced scale of money prices for landed properties. To follow out his ingenious disquisitions on these matters would swell our article into a volume; nor can we do more than notice his very able account and survey of Prussia, as one national mass, made up of conflicting interests, different forms of religion, antagonistic associations, and, indeed, with most of the limbs of its body corporate thoroughly out of joint. By the Rhine he proceeded into Switzerland, animadverting on the slender traffic which floats between Basil and Bonne, the river being often without a barge for ten miles together, notwithstanding the twenty or thirty millions of civilized human beings, who may be reckoned as more or less in connexion with so magnificent a water-way. Had it been an American stream, Prince Metternich, as an imagined ambassador from Austria to the United States, would have seen it alive with floating craft of every description, instead of 'sweeping in lonely grandeur between robber castles of former days, modern fortifications, decaying towns, military and custom-house sentinels and functionaries, and beneath vine-dotted hills, around which the labouring man toils, climbs, and lives, as he did a thousand years ago, without improvement, or advance of any importance in his social condition.'

Our tourist portrays in his most graphic manner the two small populations at the two extremities of the Rhine, far apart from each other in locality, soil, climate, and means of subsistence, yet with slender moral or national dissimilitude. The Swiss are the Dutchmen of the mountains, phlegmatic, cold, unimaginative, and money-seeking, yet vigorous, determined, energetic, patriotic, and sober. The general idea is by no means a correct one, that the Swiss Cantons, from their position between three monarchies jealous of their prosperity, hold but a precarious lease of political existence. On the contrary, they possess what appears to be paradoxical, the power of weakness! Switzerland could throw a missile of fire at any time into either Italy,

Austria, or France ; of which each being fearful, feels herself compelled to shew proper respect towards the Helvetian confederation. Should ever the eagle from Vienna dream of pouncing upon Zurich or Berne, it would quickly be seen who had the worst of it.

‘Vulpes ab arā rapuit ardenter facem  
Totamque flammis arborem circumdedit  
Hostis dolorem damno miscens sanguinis.’

The surest defence of any territory, whose strength and prosperity lie in sitting still, consists in its being also armed with such capabilities of doing mischief. The Swiss still hire themselves out as foreign mercenaries, being the *condottieri* of modern times. Yet they intensely love their country, and return to it whenever circumstances will permit them. No one can be surprised at this, nor can we withhold the following exquisite passage :—

‘The snowy peak, the waterfall, the glacier, are but the wonders of Switzerland ; her beauty is in her lakes, the blue eyes of this Alpine land. The most beautiful portion of scenery in Switzerland is, to my mind, the upper end of the lake of Geneva, from Vevay or Lausanne to Villeneuf. Scenery more sublime may be found on the lakes of Lucerne, Zug, Brientz ; but in the pure unmixed sublime of natural scenery, there is a gloom, essential perhaps to it, which cannot long be sustained without a weariness of mind. Here the gay expanse of water is enlivening ; and the water here is in due proportion to the landward part of the scenery—not too little, not too much, for the mountains. The climate, too, under the shelter of the high land ; the vegetations of various climes upon the hill-side before the eye at once, have a charm for the mind. The margin of the lake is carved out, and built up into terrace above terrace of vineyards and Indian corn-plots ; behind this narrow belt, grain-crops, orchards, grass fields, and chesnut trees have their zone ; higher still, pastures and forests occupy the ground ; above, rises a dense mass of pine-forest, broken by peaks of bare rock, shooting up, weather-worn and white, through this dark green mantle ; and last of all, the eternal snow piled high up against the deep blue sky—all this glory of nature, this varied majesty of mountain-land, within one eye-glance ! It is not surprising that this water of Geneva has seen upon its banks the most powerful minds of each succeeding generation. This land of alp and lake is indeed a mountain temple, reared for the human mind on the dull unvaried plains of Europe, to which men of every country resort, from an irresistible impulse to feel intensely, at least once in their lives, the majesty of nature. The purest of intellectual enjoyments that the material world can give, is being alone in the midst of this scenery.’

—pp. 334, 335.

Mr. Laing expends few pages upon such description, although so eminently gifted both to discern and delineate either the sub-

lime or the beautiful. He hastens to statistics, and the other practical details, which make up the daily life of that complex creature—man. With regard to population, he proves that its true and valuable increase must depend not on the mere naked number of births, but of persons born who grow up to attain a useful age. He gloats also, in a spirit of genuine philanthropy, on the air of neatness and domestic comfort which the sense of property has imprinted upon the people. Inscriptions, for instance, over gateways and gable-ends in the Simmenthal or Hasselthal, often shew that the habitation has been occupied by the same family for two hundred years; the taste of modern owners manifesting itself, after their own fashion or fancy, in new windows, or additions to the old original picturesque dwelling, 'which, with its immense projecting roof sheltering or shading all these successive little additions, looks like a hen sitting with a brood of chickens under her wings.' We can bear testimony, from delightful recollections, to the complete accuracy of all these statements; as also to the humorous preference which sensible travellers cannot fail expressing for Swiss women above Swiss men, throughout the cantons. 'The hen is the better bird all over Switzerland!' The remarks, moreover, of our tourist, upon cookery, may well reconcile us to our own truly economical habits, in the matter of feeding the outer animal. Cleanliness may, in many respects, be considered as next to godliness, however immense the distance between the two subjects. Utilitarianism, nevertheless, has not yet existed long enough in this sublunary civilized world to be altogether trustworthy, when poetry and the fine arts come upon the tapis. Hence when Mr. Laing crosses the snowy Alps, those *celeberrima mænia mundi*, we frequently have to differ from him. That the influence of painting, sculpture, and imagination, may often have been overrated by individuals, is admitted; but then the precise opposite to what is wrong is by no means consequentially what is right. Italy, as contrasted with Switzerland, is that very instance which we should always adduce to demonstrate the correctness and excellence of aiming at the *via media*, with regard to the matters just mentioned. The first transalpine city which attracted any particular attention was Genoa; from whose marble moles and quays he trumpets forth sundry laudatory strains about Leith, Dundee, Aberdeen, and Liverpool. Now there can be no doubt but that Great Britain is more prosperous than Italy; or that the wet docks and steamboats of the former have done more for our species than palaces full of statues and pictures could have effected. *Neanmoins chacun à son goût!* We quite agree with him, that capital is a bank-note for so much human labour. 'If its value is not reproduced by its outlay, the holder

of it is wasting his means, and the industrious of the country suffer a loss.'

The remarks on Naples, Vesuvius, and Pompeii, which come next in course, appear to us amongst the most truthful and important in the latter portion of the volume. His description of the finest bay in Europe, with its olives and orange-groves, its whitewalled terraces, hamlets, monasteries, vineyards, and orchards — its unparalleled sweep of coast-line, the graceful appearance and awful phenomena of the smoking volcano — might ravish into ecstacies the most enthusiastic of our native artists. No one admires or feels external nature more than Mr. Laing ; and what is a matchless picture, we would ask, but an imitation, more or less excellent, of nature ? He justly depicts the streets of this profligate capital as a wonderful den of human animals — beggars, thieves, idlers, assassins, monks, ladies, and military ! The jabber of tongues, the cooking and eating, the filthiness and vermin, are all drawn to the life. So, too, are the effects of soil and climate, of an over-numerous throng of civil officials, of a forced church-extension system, and of an enormously paid established clergy. We commend these latter considerations, with sincere personal respect and cordiality, to Sir Robert Inglis ; for our tourist shews that if the clerical staff at Glasgow could only be swollen to the Neapolitan pitch of four thousand seven hundred and eighty-three persons, which would be its proper proportion, then would the Firth of Clyde possess a city as superstitious, ignorant, lazy, and nasty, as Parthenope herself. Mr. Laing has so demolished the pretensions to pious argument of those who support grants of millions to uphold forms of religion, that Oxford will never grant him an honorary degree upon any conceivable grounds of merit whatsoever. Yet only hear him summing up the panorama, for the edification of ladies as well as gentlemen :—

' This Naples is the St. Giles of Europe. I would advise the first pedlar, who travels this road, to bring in his pack a goodly assortment of small-toothed combs ; — not that the natives are civilized enough to need such machinery : — they use more summary measures, and you see them sitting all of a row, before their doors, with their heads in each others laps, in turns, and searching for — animated ideas, — but for the benefit of the English ladies who may visit Naples. A man impregnates his skin with the effluvia of tobacco and wine, and offers no such tempting pastures to the herds and flocks of his Neapolitan majesty ; but a delicate English lady, in all her cleanliness and loveliness, swarming as she must be, — whew ! The English lady, in fact, must leave all her delicacy at home, and all her blushes, too, except a small travelling assortment, if she intends to reside among this more than half-naked and all-alive people. The country about Naples may be an earthly paradise : but it is paradise after the fall, given up to the serpent for an habitation ! ' — pp. 392, 393.

With similar humour, a sort of running fire is kept up against conservatism, along the beautiful road from Capua to Terracina; and through the Pontine marshes to Rome. He admirably exposes first, and annihilates afterwards, the evils of defending things as they are, in the sense, we mean, of resisting improvement under the pretence of withstanding innovation. His account of the Campagna around what the ancients so fondly, yet so absurdly, called the Eternal City, is in his best style; that enormous, impressive plain, boundless to the gaze, without trees, or houses, or ponds, or running waters,—but one vast ocean of waving grass, thickly studded over with piles of shapeless architectural remains. For twelve or fifteen miles, the wanderer comes upon pieces of pavement, or ancient walls of bricks, built chequer-wise, interspersed with monumental inscriptions not legible, arches supporting nothing, fountains not flowing, and broken ranges of aqueducts, stretching towards the horizon, like the skeleton limbs of the Titans. No sounds or signs of industry relieve either the ear or the eye. A lark singing in the sky, or a solitary shepherd and his fierce dog, are nearly all one meets with alive. The very gates of Rome, on the side towards Alba Longa, possess the silence and solitude of the grave. Mr. Laing at length seems to have felt the magic influence of art and imagination, as well as nature, when he moralized by moonlight amidst the marvellous wreck of the Coliseum; although even here, taking care to remember that coffee, sugar, distilled liquors, cotton, and potatoes, set in motion more human activity and industry than Roman emperors ever wielded. For St. Peter's he had evidently no taste. The revenues of the Papal States he estimates at about 1,800,000*l.* per annum. The splendid ceremonial of the Passion week, the library of the Vatican, the famous horses of Monte Cavallo, the tomb of Clement XIII., lead him to an interesting comparison between ancient and modern sculpture; as also to a disquisition, not less interesting, upon the present state, and what some would term the religious philosophy, of Catholicism and Protestantism. Both the presbytery and secession in Scotland, and episcopacy and nonconformity in England, have yet much to learn, and, indeed, to unlearn, on these subjects; as we have already, in recent papers, endeavoured to impress upon the various classes of our readers. Mr. Laing mentions the curious fact, that in every street of the papal metropolis, there are, at short distances, public primary schools for the education of the children of the lower and middle classes in the neighbourhood. Rome, with a population of 158,668 souls, has 372 of these seminaries, with 482 teachers and 14,099 children in attendance. The priesthood and state functionaries well understand that mere reading and writing do not constitute

thinking. Education, in the Prussian and Italian sense of the word, may be defined as the art of teaching people not to teach themselves. Roman-catholic clergy have discovered that what they have to do in this respect is to guide absolutely what cannot be resisted immediately. They therefore, instead of the stark stalwart folly of imitating our Brahmins of the establishment, who resist all education deserving the name of national, reap the popularity of instructing the lower classes ; taking good care themselves to elevate still higher than before that level of knowledge which forms the groundwork of their own professional position. *Fas est ab hoste doceri !* The flocks will follow, they conceive, the more readily for being trained, if the leaders only keep ahead of the crowd. So says our ingenious traveller ; concurring as he does with us, that neither the Record nor Reformation Societies are the instruments appointed by Providence for preserving spiritual liberty in these islands.

With Florence he was greatly delighted. He found the labouring portion of the community well clothed, well lodged, well fed, and thoroughly happy ; all which he principally attributes to the subdivision of property. There were in Tuscany, in 1836, to a population less than a million and a half, upwards of 130,000 landed estates. In other words, out of every century of families nearly fifty possess a portion of the soil. Hence the husbandry has become just what might be expected, assimilated to that of Switzerland and Flanders. The government also is as liberal as any Austrian government can be ; the grand duke living amongst his subjects like their father, more than like their master. Yet it must never be forgotten, that one ill-educated or ill-advised sovereign might undo all the good his predecessors have ever planned or accomplished. 'Capital, commerce, manufacturing industry, the great agencies in the movement of modern society, will not trust themselves freely upon so unstable a foundation. This will ever be the impediment to any considerable progress in Prussia, Austria, or Tuscany, and all the paternally governed, but autocratic states, in the development of the industry of their people. The prosperity, national wealth, and public spirit, they aim at, are inseparable from free institutions and legislative power lodged with the people themselves, and independent of the life or will of an individual.' Crossing the Apennines, Mr. Laing proceeded to Bologna ; and thence by Ferrara and Padua to Venice. We were struck with the correctness of his observation, that the distinctive principle of Gothic architecture is to seek its effects by extensions in the height, and that of Grecian, on the contrary, by those parallel to the horizon. Exceptions will, however, occur, as for instance, with regard to the dome ; unless this be considered merely characteristic of the Roman school. Lombardy

would appear not to be so prosperous as Tuscany, although in a much better condition than the Papal or Sicilian states. The effects of an Italian climate lead to that homeless, and to us, apparently, miserable plan, of eating as many meals as possible out of doors. Operatives, from the Alps to Calabria, often seem to abjure roofs; and the blessings of Italy thus frequently become her curses. Domestic habits will never flourish so well as by the ingle-nook and the hearth-stone. Necessity, when not too stern and severe, softens into the parent of morality and civilization. Italy has no natural divisions of her social body into growers and consumers; because every habitable district grows the same products, corn, wine, oil, silk, and fruits. Each consumer is therefore a producer; neither is there much command of fire or water to set machinery in motion. The world will never behold her intent on manufactures, nor begirt with a seafaring population. All capital, industry, intelligence, civil authority, and public or private business, must centralize into the towns; each of which, within its own circle, suffices for itself, living as a large metayer family upon its own trade and means; nor being otherwise than an insulated oasis, connected as little as possible with its contemporaries in the land. Hence these cities or municipal populations have sailed out of sight of the main body of the people; a state of disunion, which may be deemed the result rather of natural than political causes. There has ever been an enormous outlay of unproductive capital. The volume concludes with some interesting notices of Milan, Como, the Austrian government generally, Lago Maggiore, the Borromean Islands, the Alps, and the social state of France, Prussia, and Italy; and we cannot forbear tendering our author very cordial thanks for the pleasure he has afforded us. Whatever falls from his pen is full of thought, and well worthy, in every way, of consideration. We have freely expressed our own opinions on the various topics which he has touched, and on which he has thrown so much light and information. His style and reputation require no encomium; the former is terse, energetic, not always polished, and now and then highly elliptical, if not almost ungrammatical; the latter is based upon the most solid foundations, penetration connected with the utmost comprehensiveness of mind, together with a spirit of patriotism, and powers of description, we should say, of the highest order. His Scotticisms, for such we presume they are, we could wish expunged. Mr. Laing is bound to write English for the three united kingdoms; and to our ears, the use of 'consumpt' for *consumption*,—of such adjectives or participles as 'clamant' for *clamorous*, of such a verb as 'slumped,' unless it is a misprint for *lumped*, sounds disagreeably. But he has no greater ad-

mirers, upon the whole, than ourselves. We almost are induced to desire for him a life of travels; until, like the wandering Jew, he shall have visited every land under heaven, and put upon record his observations respecting them. Might not his next trip be to India, now brought within six weeks of Falmouth? An octavo from him, upon each of the presidencies, would be more valuable to the East and the West, than three ordinary governor-generals! To whatever shores he may next wend his way, we trust he may enjoy the survey of them as much as he appears to have done those of the South of Europe; and that he will favour us, on his return, with as ingenious lucubrations as several in the present volume, of which we now take our leave with reluctance and gratitude.

---

Art. III. THE BIBLICAL CABINET. Vol. XXXII. *Annotations on some of the Messianic Psalms; from the Commentary of Rosenmüller; with the Latin Version and Notes of Dathe.* Translated by Robert Johnston; to which is prefixed an Introduction and Preface. pp. exxiii. 320. Sm. 8vo. Thomas Clark: Edinburgh. 1841.

Vol. XXXIII. *The Biblical Geography of Asia Minor, Phœnicia, and Arabia.* By E. F. C. Rosenmüller, D.D. Translated from the German, by the Rev. N. Morren, A.M. With an Appendix, containing an abstract of the more important Geographical Illustrations of Messrs. Smith and Robinson, in their 'Biblical Researches.' pp. 363. Sm. 8vo. Clark: Edinburgh. 1841.

WE have much pleasure in introducing these two volumes of the 'Biblical Cabinet' to the notice of our readers. In excellence and usefulness they are second to none of the other volumes of that series, and are superior to most.

Of volume thirty-three, we need not to say much, as it forms only the continuation of a work of which two volumes have already appeared in the 'Cabinet.' The subject of sacred geography is one of which it is hard to say whether the importance or the difficulties be the greater. Apart from the pleasure arising from our being able to identify with localities of recent interest the scenes of the venerable and ever-attractive events of patriarchal and Jewish history, there is the same impossibility of accurately understanding the details of that history, without the helps which geography supplies, as attaches to all history whatever. It is not easy, however, in every case, to fix upon the exact localities even of the transactions which are most fully described; and, with regard to many of the places mentioned in Scripture, the attempt to ascertain their proper position on the map is truly *opus plenum aleæ.* In this department of inquiry, much learned labour

has already been expended. The names of Bochart, Reland, Bachiene, Michaelis, and others, are familiar to every Biblical student as those to whom sacred geography is under the earliest and deepest obligations. In their writings, however, there is much which is fanciful and unsatisfactory, and many points are left by them uncleared. The progress of philological and exegetical science has conspired with the results obtained by personal examination, on the part of travellers, of the districts embraced within the sphere of sacred geography, to remove many of the obscurities and correct several of the errors with which the writings of the earlier inquirers are burdened. A vast mass of materials had thus been prepared, which waited only for some competent hand to arrange them in due order and proportion, and thus to present to the Biblical student an authentic guide in this department of sacred science. After one or two less successful attempts appeared the *Handbuch der Biblischen Alterthumskunde* (Manual of the Science of Biblical Antiquities) of Dr. Rosenmüller, of which the subject of Biblical Geography occupies the first four parts, and that of Biblical Natural History the remaining part. For such a work the author was eminently qualified. He brought to it a sound judgment, profound learning, and a mind exercised for the greater part of a long life in all those studies which have a bearing on the due interpretation of Scripture. The result has been the production of a work which leaves nothing to be desired in relation to those departments of sacred science of which it treats, excepting in so far as subsequent researches may throw still further light upon some points which the author has been compelled to leave in a certain degree of obscurity. It is to be regretted that the learned author did not live to complete his plan, and to do for the whole of Biblical Archæology what he has so well done for those parts of it he has taken up.

Out of this work four volumes of the 'Biblical Cabinet' have now been extracted; viz., the three on Biblical Geography, translated by Mr. Morren, and the one on Biblical Mineralogy and Botany, translated partly by Mr. Repp and partly by Mr. Morren. Having done so much, we hope the publisher will complete the work by favouring us with a translation of what yet remains, along with new title-pages, so as to enable the purchasers to bind the whole as uniform parts of the same work. Mr. Morren must be now so familiar both with the work of translation and the peculiar style of Rosenmüller, that it would be no great burden for him to undertake this task; and he has executed so admirably the parts already entrusted to him, that we are sure the work could not be in better hands. In the volume before us, the same excellences, on the part of the translator, are apparent, which distinguish its predecessors,—fidelity to his author without

the sacrifice of his vernacular idiom, and an ever-watchful care to supply to the student such additional information as may be gleaned from sources not accessible to the author, or not extant at the time he wrote. For the Biblical Geography of Asia, there is no work in our language which can be placed in competition with the volumes which Mr. Morren has, as the translator of Rosenmüller, produced; and we cordially recommend them, therefore, to all who are engaged in the study of the sacred text.

For the contents of the other volume of the 'Cabinet' now before us, we are also indebted chiefly to the younger Rosenmüller, as he continued to be called, even after he had passed threescore years and ten. Besides a translation of parts of his 'Scholia on the Psalms,' this volume contains some other contributions to the stores of the Biblical student, which we must notice in order. In the first place, we have the Translator's Preface, containing some very pertinent remarks on the importance of Hebrew learning, followed by others of less value on the neologianism of the German critics. On this latter subject, and indeed on that of German theological literature generally, we cannot compliment Mr. Johnston on the display of any very accurate or extensive information. The following, for instance, is one of his statements on this head:—'There are two faults, besetting sins of later German Biblical critics, a fondness for unnecessary emendations of the text, and for significations of words, drawn from the cognate languages, especially the Arabic.'—p. xiv. Now, if there be one thing more than another in the department of Biblical criticism by which the *later* German critics are distinguished, it is their scrupulous, almost fastidious aversion from unnecessary emendations of the sacred text. Such emendations are regarded by them as first-rate critical offences, fatal to the scholarly reputation of those by whom they are indulged; and it is for the tendency on the part of British critics to such courses that they have been most frequently censured by those of Germany. We appeal, in support of our assertion, to the volumes already translated of the 'Biblical Cabinet,' where the reader will search in vain for any traces of this alleged 'fondness for unnecessary emendations of the text.' We appeal also to the recent critical editions of the original texts of Scripture which have been produced in Germany, where the authority of documentary evidence is most scrupulously followed in determining the proper readings. If Mr. Johnston had spoken of the critics of the last century, of the Reiskes, the Houbigants, (not Hubigant, by-the-bye, as he invariably spells it,) and others of their school, his observation would not have been far from the truth; though in the works of his favourite Lowth, and in those of his fol-

lowers, he might have found evidences of a rage for emendation which no continental school has equalled. Has he yet to learn, that a sturdy Swiss deemed it necessary to come forth as the champion of the Hebrew text against the criticism of Lowth, which he treated as ‘a malignant disease arising either from the critic’s greater fondness for elegances of language than for grammatical accuracy, or from his love of such fame and applause as his efforts at emendation might bring?’\* Much about the same time, Theodore Frederick Stange directed his able and unsparing censures against the emendationists, first in his ‘Anticritica in locos quosdam Psalmorum a Criticis sollicitatos,’† and afterwards in his ‘Symmikta Theologica,’‡ works which are still held in high repute in Germany for the soundness of judgment and learning which they display, no less than for the service they rendered in overthrowing the influence of a school to which even Michaelis had too much lent his sanction. From the date of these publications to the present time all the Biblical critics of Germany, with hardly a single respectable exception, have studiously avoided what they have stigmatized by the appellation ‘Emendirsucht,’ or, as Mr. Johnston has termed it, ‘a fondness for unnecessary emendations of the text;’ so that no charge more unjust or unfounded could have been brought against them than that which in respect of this matter he has adduced. As to the charge of fondness ‘for significations of words drawn from the cognate languages, especially the Arabic,’ every Hebrew scholar is aware that to this source we stand indebted for much valuable aid in fixing the meaning of a great number of Hebrew words, and that it is, when properly used, a safe and legitimate source to apply to for this purpose. That its value has been unduly magnified, and that it has been resorted to in cases where other and better sources were accessible, must be admitted by all who know the writings of Schultens and his school. Perhaps it was to these writings that our author referred, in the remark above quoted. If so, we must remind him that the writers of this school were the *older Dutch*, and not the *later German* critics. Other instances of Mr. Johnston’s imperfect acquaintance with foreign literature are apparent throughout the volume. Thus, Herder’s ‘Geist der Ebraischen Poesie,’ is always referred to as if it were written in Latin, by the title, ‘De Genio Poesios Hebr.,’ a title which Rosenmüller, writing in Latin, has given it appropriately enough, but which would not have been retained, we should suppose, in a professed translation

\* ‘Vindiciae S. Textus Hebraei Esaiae Vatis aduersus Roberti Lowthi Ven. Ep. Lond. Criticam.’ A Dav. Kochero, Bernæ, 1786.—Pref., p. 7.

† II. Voll. Lips. 1791, et Halæ, 1794.

‡ III. Partes, Halæ, 1802-5.

of Rosenmüller's Latin, had the translator not been ignorant of the real title of the book, and apparently also of the fact that this very work is extant in an English version.\* At p. 122 the translator refers his readers to 'Gesenius's *Lectures*,' instead of 'Gesenius's *Lehrgebäude*' (System of the Hebrew Tongue). At p. 127, Kühnöl's 'Messianische Weissagungen u. s. w.' is cited by the title 'Vaticiniorum Messianorum versio et interpretatio vernacula,' which is Rosenmüller's *description* of the book, and as such ought to have been translated. In the next line, and everywhere throughout the volume, *Ruperti* is changed into *Rupert*, under the impression, we suppose, that *Ruperti* is the genitive of *Rupertus*. So also, p. 60, *Justi* is turned into *Justus*. Other instances of the same sort might be added, but we forbear. These are adduced simply for the purpose of shewing that Mr. Johnston's judgment of German critics, however confidently pronounced, is not deserving of that respect which some, with whose prejudices against them it happens to accord, may be disposed to attach to it. We must add further, that as the object of the references in question is to direct the student to fuller sources of information on the topics under discussion, it is a grave offence to cite the titles in such a way as to mislead the inquirer, or leave him without the power of identifying the work referred to.†

Mr. Johnston's Preface is followed by Hengstenberg's admirable Introduction to the Messianic Psalms, as translated by Dr. Keith, of Virginia, U. S. This translation is executed with commendable fidelity and considerable elegance; and as the proprietor of the 'Cabinet' has already given two extended extracts from it, we wish he would, in some future publication, supply his readers with the rest. We know of no work more deserving the careful perusal of every student of the Old-Testament Prophecies than Hengstenberg's *Christologie*. It contains an immense storehouse of the soundest philology and exegesis applied to a part of Scripture of the deepest interest to the Christian, but surrounded at the same time with peculiar difficulties. The part of which a translation is printed in the volume before us, though professedly occupied only in proving the Messianic character of certain of the Psalms, contains some very valuable expositions of passages

\* 'The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry.' By J. G. Herder. Translated from the German, by James Marsh, Burlington, U. S. 1833; 2 vols. 12mo. See Horne's Introduction, vol. ii. part ii. p. 171.

† Mr. Johnston is not always correct even on points of British literature. Thus he confidently ascribes the article on 'Kant's Philosophy,' in the first volume of the 'Edinburgh Review,' to Sir James Macintosh. If he will consult Welsh's 'Life of Dr. Thomas Brown,' he will find that that article was furnished by the latter philosopher.

in these, the meaning of which has been controverted or felt to be obscure.\*

A translation follows of Rosenmüller's Introduction to the Book of Psalms, and then of his Notes on Psalms ii., xvi., xl., lxxii., cx. Why those on Psalm xxii. and Psalm lx., both of which are included by Hengstenberg in the number of the Messianic Psalms, have not been added, we do not very well understand. It is true that neither of these is viewed by Rosenmüller as relating to the Messiah; but as his annotations are valuable, chiefly for their philology, we do not see that this formed a reason of sufficient weight for excluding them, the more especially as the translator expresses his confidence that 'to any improper impression that might be produced by the peculiar views of Rosenmüller, Dathe's Notes and Hengstenberg's Introduction to the Messianic Psalms, will furnish a sufficient antidote.'—*Preface*, p. xiii. In Rosenmüller's notes on these two Psalms, there is nothing peculiarly offensive, and the addition of them would have given a harmony and completeness to the volume, which it now wants.

As a translator, Mr. Johnston is sufficiently free, but we have not detected any instances in which the meaning of his author has suffered from this. We think he has succeeded in giving a very faithful and readable version of Rosenmüller's Introduction and Annotations. Of the value of these to the Biblical student we need not speak. For accurate acquaintance with the structure and idioms of the Hebrew, for correct principles of hermeneutics, and for general sobriety of judgment and exegetical tact, few interpreters can be named worthy of a place by the side of this distinguished scholar. We are happy that any portion, however small, of his invaluable 'Scholia,' are by this translation placed within the reach of those whose imperfect acquaintance with Latin, or limited means, may render access to his work in the original difficult or impossible.

Appended to the translation of Rosenmüller's notes is a Latin version of the five Psalms on which the notes are made, excerpted by Mr. Johnston from the original of these notes. We do not very well see the use of this, except to swell the volume. The very fact of presenting the notes in English implies that the book is intended for those who are not familiar with Latin; and that such should be presented with a Latin version of the Psalms anno-

\* The disadvantage of possessing only a part of a connected work will be frequently experienced by the reader of this volume, in consequence of the numerous references, in the part extracted, to other parts of the 'Christologie.' These should certainly have been supplied in notes, or the references to them have been omitted, as ignorance is better in such a case than unallayed curiosity.

tated on, seems to us somewhat preposterous. The same remark applies to Dathe's Version, which is given in the original Latin, followed by a translation of his notes into English, at the close of the volume. We think the whole of this might have been dispensed with, as it tends to give a piebald character to the volume, and looks like an unnecessary expanding of its bulk.

In conclusion, whilst cordially recommending both the volumes before us to our readers, we must call the attention of the publisher to the incorrect manner in which many words in Hebrew and Greek are printed, especially in Number Thirty-two. We have marked some scores of errata of this kind in this volume in the course of reading it; most of them, it is true, in the matter of accents and vowel-points; but some of them of a graver sort. Of the latter, we must specify a few, that we may not seem to advance a charge which we cannot substantiate:—

Page xl, line 10, for	עַל־פָּנִים	read	עַל־בָּנִים
— 14, 2nd fr. bot.	אַוְרָחָה	„	אַוְרָחָה
— 30, line 8, for	סְכָתָם	„	מְכָתָם
— 33, line 23, for	Ἐπιληγνιοίσιν	„	Ἐπιληγνιοίσιν.
— 34, line 21, for	Φαλμοὶ	„	Ψαλμοὶ.*
ibid. ibid. for	Φαλτύριον	„	Ψαλτύριον.
ibid. line 28, for	ψσάλλειν	„	ψάλλειν.
ibid. ibid. for	τὸ τῶ	„	τὸ τῶν.
— 64, line 16, for	הַשִּׁיחַ	„	הַמְשִׁיחַ
— 109, line 8, for	ταιδείας	„	παιδείας.
— 114, line 21, for	יִתְוֹהָ	„	יִתְוֹהָ
— 120, line 9, for	רְדָךְ	„	דְּרָךְ
— 121, line 14, for	הַוְסִי	„	הַוְסִי

This brings us to the end of the second Psalm, beyond which it is not necessary to pursue our list of errata, as the above will serve for a sufficient specimen of what may be found in the notes on the other four Psalms. In the part over which we have gone, the same error is frequently repeated; in such cases, we have, with one exception, omitted to specify the error oftener than once. In the volume translated by Mr. Morren, the number of such errata is much smaller; but even there also we have noted enough to justify us in calling the attention of the publisher to the subject. Authors, living at a distance from the press, cannot attend to these minutiae with all the care that is required, and

\* Repeated on the next page.

therefore must leave it in a great measure with the publisher to see that the necessary corrections are made. We are sure Mr. Clark is so thoroughly imbued with a praiseworthy desire to issue the volumes of the 'Cabinet,' with everything in the shape of *getting up* which can add to their usefulness or their attractiveness, that he will not take in ill part our having called his attention to a matter which is calculated materially to affect both the reputation and the value of his publications.

---

Art. IV. *A Visit to the United States in 1841.* By Joseph Sturge.  
8vo. London : Hamilton and Co. Birmingham : B. Hudson.

THERE are few men for whom we entertain a more cordial esteem than for the author of this volume. The unostentatious character of his philanthropy, his transparency and deep earnestness, the unselfish consecration of his time and property to the wellbeing of his fellow men, and the beautiful spirit of Christian love, and deep sense of personal responsibility, which pervade all he says and does, have secured for him a much larger measure of affectionate respect than falls to the lot of many of his contemporaries. The career of Mr. Sturge exhibits a combination of qualities rarely found in unison. Sincerely attached to the principles and discipline of the straitest sect of our religion, he yet possesses a catholicity of spirit which identifies him with everything human, and renders him the zealous associate of other philanthropists in all confederations which, without violating his religious convictions, seek the welfare of man. Mr. Sturge, as is well known to our readers, was foremost in the great struggle which effected the abolition of slavery in our western colonies, as also in the subsequent measures, which accomplished the annihilation of its substitute. Alive to the importance of a correct exhibition of the effects of abolition, he characteristically resolved on a visit to Jamaica, in order to learn by personal experience, what were the capabilities and prospects of the enfranchised population. The result of his observations was given to the British public in an interesting volume, which was noticed in our journal at the time of its appearance.

The work now before us contains a similar narrative, undertaken in the same spirit of enlightened charity, and prosecuted with a simplicity and earnestness, which, while they betoken the hold the subject had taken on the traveller's mind, bespeak the good will and confidence of his reader. It has rarely been our lot to peruse a volume, which carried with it more convincing evidence of the honesty of the reporter, or of the candour with which judgment is pronounced on the character and actions of

the men described. Mr. Sturge's great objects in visiting the United States were, to use his own words, 'the universal abolition of slavery, and the promotion of permanent international peace.' The former of these topics is most prominent in his narrative, in the course of which, observations on other subjects of interest and importance, always sensible, and frequently deserving of grave attention, are freely interspersed. 'Nearly the whole of the narrative portion of the publication,' we are informed, 'has been sent to America to different individuals who were concerned in, or present at, the transactions related, and has been returned with a verification of the facts: so that the reader has the strongest guarantee for their accuracy.' The inferences and comments are of course Mr. Sturge's, who is quite willing they should be subjected to as rigorous an examination as is consistent with a candid construction of his statements.

Our author embarked at Portsmouth, for New York, in the 'British Queen,' on the 10th of March, 1841, and encountered during his voyage a succession of gales, which seriously endangered the safety of the vessel. It was in the same storm that the President steamer, coming in an opposite direction, was lost. 'Our escape,' says Mr. Sturge, 'under Divine Providence, must be attributed to the great strength of the vessel, which had been thoroughly repaired since her last voyage, and to the skill and indefatigable attention of the captain.' Their stock of coals being very much reduced, and the boards of the paddle-wheels having been carried away, they made for Halifax, Nova Scotia, whither they happily arrived on the evening of the 30th. After a stay of twenty-four hours, they left for New York, which they made during the night of the 3rd of April. In this city, Mr. Sturge remained some days, which were spent among the most distinguished members of the abolition cause. Of the sketches furnished, we can find room only for the following, which refers to the brothers, *Arthur* and *Lewis Tappan*:—

'The former was elected president of the American Anti-slavery Society on its formation, and remained at its head until the division which took place last year, when he became president of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. His name is not more a byword of reproach than a watchword of alarm throughout the slave states, and the slave holders have repeatedly set a high price upon his head by advertisement in the public papers. In the just estimation of the pro-slavery party, Arthur Tappan is ABOLITION personified; and truly the cause needs not to be ashamed of its representative, for a more deservedly honoured and estimable character it would be difficult to find. In personal deportment he is unobtrusive and silent; his sterling qualities are veiled by reserve, and are in themselves such as make the least show—clearness and judgment, prudence and great decision. He is the head of an extensive mercantile establishment, and the high esti-

mation in which he is held by his fellow citizens, notwithstanding the unpopularity of his views on slavery, is the result of a long and undeviating career of public spirit, and private integrity, and of an uninterrupted succession of acts of benevolence. During a series of years of commercial prosperity, his revenues were distributed with an unsparing hand through the various channels which promised benefit to his fellow-creatures; and in this respect, his gifts, large and frequent though they were, were probably exceeded in usefulness by the influence of his example as a man and a Christian.

‘ His brother Lewis, with the same noble and disinterested spirit in the application of his pecuniary resources, possesses the rare faculty of incessant labour; which, when combined, as in his case, with great intellectual and physical capacity, eminently qualifies for a leading position in society. He unites, in a remarkable degree, the apparently incompatible qualities of versatility and concentration; and his admirable endowments have been applied in the service of the helpless and the oppressed with corresponding success. He has been from the beginning one of the most active members of the central Anti-Slavery Committee in New York, a body that has directed the aggressive operations against slavery, on a national scale, with a display of resources, and an untiring and resolute vigour, that have attracted the admiration of all, who, sympathizing in their object, have had the privilege of watching their proceedings. Of those who have impressed the likeness of their own character on these proceedings, Lewis Tappan is one of the chief; and he has shared with his brother the most virulent attacks from the pro-slavery party. Some years ago he had the ear of a negro sent to him by post, in an insulting anonymous letter. During the past year, though marked by a severe domestic affliction, in addition to his engagements as a merchant, in partnership with his brother Arthur, and his various public and private duties as a man and as a citizen, in the performance of which I believe he is most punctual and exemplary, he has edited, almost without assistance, the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter, and has also been one of the most active members of a committee of benevolent individuals formed to watch over the interest of the Amistad captives. Besides superintending the maintenance, education, and other interests of these Africans, it was necessary to defend their cause against the whole power of the United States’ government, to raise funds for these objects, to interest foreign governments in their welfare, and, more than all, to keep them constantly before the public, not only for their own sakes, but that a portion of the sympathy and right feeling which was elicited in their favour might be reflected towards the native slave population of the country, whose claim to freedom rests upon the same ground of natural and indefeasible right. With what success this interesting cause has been prosecuted is well expressed in a single sentence by a valued transatlantic correspondent of mine, who, writing at the most critical period of the controversy, says, ‘ We, or rather Lewis Tappan, has made the whole nation look the captives in the face.’—pp. 3—5.

It has long been the honourable distinction of the Society of

Friends in this country, that they have continued, through evil report as well as through good report, the uncompromising and zealous advocates of the cause of the oppressed Africans. When the other churches of Great Britain were careless and inactive, they laboured with indefatigable zeal on behalf of the miserable outcasts, whom others refused to help or pity. Had it not been for them, the Anti-Slavery Society must have terminated its sittings in utter despair. The same enviable distinction attached to their society in America during the last century. Some years prior to the labours of the venerable Clarkson, the society was 'pervaded by a noiseless agitation on the subject of slavery, which resulted in the abandonment of the slave trade, in the liberation of their slaves, and in the adoption of a rule of discipline, excluding slave-holders from religious fellowship.' It would have been well for the interests of humanity and the purity of the church, if this noble example had been followed by other communities. Had it been so, the case of the churches of America would be vastly different from what it now is, and the world, instead of blaspheming the name of Christ, would have witnessed another demonstration of the constraining influence of his love. That her churches should be the bulwarks of slavery, as they undoubtedly are, is amongst the most anomalous and disgraceful of her features, and may well awaken the most gloomy and fearful anticipations. The decision to which the Society of Friends thus early came, was not, it must be remembered, an inoperative one; it involved the sacrifice of an immense mass of property, and closed against its members many sources of profitable occupation. 'One can scarcely avoid,' as Mr. Sturge remarks, 'looking back with regret to times, when convictions of duty had such power, when Christian principle was carried out, whatever the cost. Then, indeed, was exhibited by the American 'Friends' the fruit of a world-overcoming faith.' It is deeply to be deplored that a society, so honourably distinguished in the early history of this great question, should have failed in more recent times to do justice to their recorded 'testimony,' by carrying out the principles which their fathers avowed, to their legitimate and only consistent result. But to this we shall have occasion to advert, as we proceed. In the mean time, we transfer to our pages the following anecdote of one who may justly be designated the Granville Sharp of America, as illustrative of the spirit by which the 'Friends' of that day were distinguished:—

'The same individual related some interesting particulars of the late Elisha Tyson, of Baltimore, an abolitionist of the old school, who had rescued many negroes from illegal bondage. Dr. Fussell was an eye-witness of the following occurrence:—A poor woman had been seized by the agents of Woolfolk, the notorious Maryland slave dealer, and

was carried along the street in which Elisha Tyson lived. When they arrived opposite his house, she demanded to see 'Father Tyson.' A crowd collected about the party, and she so far moved their pity, that they insisted that her wish should be complied with. One of the men hereupon went to inform his employer, who galloped off, pistol in hand, and found Elisha Tyson standing at his own door. Woolfolk, with an oath, declared he would 'send him to hell for interfering with his *property*.' Elisha Tyson coolly exposed his breast, telling him that he dared not shoot, and that he (Woolfolk) 'was in hell already, though he did not know it.' An investigation followed; the poor woman was proved to be illegally detained, and was set at liberty. The death of Elisha Tyson was remarkable. He had received a letter detailing the particulars of the restoration of certain negroes to freedom, through his instrumentality; also informing him of their joy and happiness on their deliverance. Under the influence of a sudden and too violent emotion of delight, he fell down with the letter in his hand, and instantly expired. The affection of this grateful people was testified by thousands crowding to the house, previous to the interment, and they were permitted to view the remains of their benefactor. It is generally allowed that so bold and uncompromising an advocate of the negroes' right does not now remain in the slave states.'—pp. 10, 11.

From New York, Mr. Sturge proceeded in various directions, to visit the principal cities of the free states, and was thus brought into contact with abolitionists of every grade and creed. His intercourse was mainly with the members of his own religious body, and nothing can be imagined more commendable or lovely, than the earnestness with which he sought to awaken them to a sense of their duty in relation to the bondsmen of their country. A more beautiful specimen of faithfulness and charity, of the tenderest love combined with the most earnest appeals and the most direct expostulations, we have never witnessed. It cannot but be that important results must flow from a visit characterized by such a spirit, and conducted by a wisdom which never failed.

It is well known to our readers that a division has recently taken place among the abolitionists of America. Events had been leading to it for some short time previously, but the extent of the division was not known until the spring of 1840. The union existing among American abolitionists was first disturbed by the course pursued in the 'Boston Liberator,' of which William Lloyd Garrison was the editor. The eminent services which Mr. Garrison had rendered to the anti-slavery cause, attached great importance to whatever he did in his editorial capacity, and afforded a seeming justification of those who imputed to abolitionists at large the opinions which were advocated in the columns of the 'Liberator.' 'His paper was not the special organ of any anti-slavery society, yet it was regarded by general consent of the friends and enemies of the cause, as the organ of

the anti-slavery movement. The discussion in its columns of new and startling doctrines on subjects unconnected with slavery, occasioned many of the former much uneasiness and embarrassment, while it furnished the latter with new excuses for their enmity, and with the pretence, that under cover of *abolition* lurked a design of assailing institutions and opinions justly held in regard throughout the Christian world.' The subsequent progress of the schism, which has unhappily, for a time, weakened the efforts of American abolitionism, is thus described by Mr. Sturge :—

' In the summer of 1837, Sarah and Angelina Grimke visited New England, for the purpose of advocating the cause of the slave, with whose condition they were well acquainted, being natives of South Carolina, and having been themselves at one time implicated in the system. Their original intention was to confine their public labours to audiences of their own sex, but they finally addressed promiscuous assemblies. Their intimate knowledge of the true character of slavery, their zeal, devotion, and gifts as speakers, produced a deep impression wherever they went. They met with considerable opposition from colonizationists, and also from a portion of the New England clergy, on the ground of the impropriety of their publicly addressing mixed audiences. This called forth in the 'Liberator,' which at that time, I understand, was under the patronage, though I believe not under the control, of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, a discussion of the abstract question of the entire equality of the rights and duties of the two sexes. Here was a new element of discord. In 1838, at the annual New England convention of abolitionists, a woman was, for the first time, placed on committees with men; an innovation upon the general custom of the community which excited much dissatisfaction in the minds of many.

' About this time the rightfulness of civil and church government began to be called in question, through the columns of the 'Liberator,' by its editor and correspondents. These opinions were concurrently advocated with the doctrine of non-resistance. Those who hold these opinions, while they deny that civil and ecclesiastical government are of divine authority, are yet passively submissive to the authority of the former, though they abstain from exercising the political rights of citizenship. There were not wanting those, among the opponents of abolition, to charge the anti-slavery body at large with maintaining these views, and in consequence serious embarrassments were thrown in the way of a successful prosecution of the cause. The executive committee of the society at New York were placed in a difficult position; but, as far as I am able to judge, they endeavoured to hold on the steady tenour of their way, without, on the one hand, countenancing the introduction of extraneous matters upon the anti-slavery platform, or, on the other hand, yielding to the clamour of the pro-slavery party, whether in church or state.

' In subsequent anti-slavery meetings in Boston, New York, and

elsewhere, it became manifest that there was a radical difference of opinion on the subject of political action; the non-resistant and no-government influence operating decidedly against the employment of the elective franchise in the anti-slavery cause; and the agitation of this question, as well as that of the rights of women, in their meetings, gave to them a discordant and party character, painfully contrasting with the previous peaceful and harmonious action of the societies. That some of both parties began to overlook the great subject of the slaves' emancipation, in zealous advocacy of, or opposition to, these new measures, I cannot well doubt, judging from the testimony of those, who, not fully sympathizing with either, endeavoured to bring all back to the single object of the anti-slavery association. In addition to these intestine troubles, the pro-slavery made strenuous exertions to fasten upon the society the responsibility of the opinions and proceedings of its non-resistant and no-government members. Under these circumstances, it is easy to understand the interruption, for a season, of the unity of feeling and action which had previously characterized the assemblies of the abolitionists. The actual separation in the societies took place in the spring of 1840. The members of the executive committee at New York, with one exception, seceded, and became members of the committee of the 'new organization,' under the name of the 'American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.' There are, therefore, now two central or national anti-slavery societies; the 'old organization' retaining the designation of the 'American Anti-Slavery Society.' The state societies have, for the most part, taken up a position of neutrality, or independence of both. It is important to add, that the division took place on the 'women's rights' question, and that this is the only one of the controverted points which the American Anti-Slavery Society has officially affirmed; and it is argued, on behalf of their view of this question, that since, in the original 'constitution' of the society, the term, describing its members, officers, &c., is 'persons,' that women are plainly invested with the same eligibility to appointments, and the same right to vote and act, as the other sex. I need not say how this 'constitutional' argument is met on the other side. The other new views are held by comparatively few persons, and neither anti-slavery society in America is responsible for them. In conclusion, I rejoice to be able to add, that the separation, in its effects, appears to have been a healing measure; a better and kinder feeling is beginning to pervade all classes of American abolitionists; the day of mutual crimination seems to be passing away, and there is strong reason to hope that the action of the respective societies will henceforward harmoniously tend to the same object. That such may be the result is my sincere desire. It is proper in this connexion to state, that a considerable number of active and prominent abolitionists do not entirely sympathize with either division of the anti-slavery society; and there are comparatively few who make their views, for or against the question on which the division took place, a matter of conscience.'—pp. 23—26.

At Baltimore, where the internal slave trade is carried on in the most open manner, Mr. Sturge visited the establishment of

an extensive slave-dealer, which was located in one of the principal streets. He was received by the proprietor with great courtesy, and was permitted freely to inspect the premises. At the time of his visit there were only five or six negroes *in stock*, a cargo having been shipped off to New Orleans a few days before. Mr. Sturge, as was to be expected, dealt faithfully with this dealer in human flesh, but was met by the common plea, that the trade was legal, and 'that dealing in slaves was not worse than slaveholding.' In both these positions the Baltimore trader was correct, yet what intellect free from the depraving influence of the worst prejudices can fail to perceive their utter futility as a defence of this most abhorrent and criminal traffic. Even the Baltimore slave-holders themselves recoil from social intercourse with the man by whom their farms are stocked, though his style of living is in every way equal to their own. In so doing, however, they only condemn themselves, and add the guilt of hypocrisy to the foul crime of slave-holding. Mr. Sturge subsequently addressed to the Baltimore slave-trader an expostulatory letter, of the style and temper of which it is impossible to speak too highly. Compassion for the slave is beautifully mingled with solicitude for the slave-trader, who is reasoned with and entreated in a tone at once courteous and unswerving. The letter has already received a wide circulation, yet we are tempted by its worth and beauty to transfer it to our pages:—

' Since thou courteously allowed me, in company with my friend, J. G. Whittier, to visit thy slave establishment in the city of Baltimore, some weeks since, I have often felt a desire to address a few lines to thee. I need not, perhaps, say that my feelings were painfully exercised in looking over thy buildings, fitted up with bolts and bars, for the reception of human beings for sale. A sense of the misery and suffering of the unfortunate slaves who have been from time to time confined there, of their separation from home and kindred, and of the dreary prospect before them of a life of unrequited toil in the south and south-west, rested heavily upon me. I could there realize the true nature of the system of slavery. I was in a market-house for human flesh, where humanity is degraded to a level with the brute, and where children of our common Father in heaven, and for whom our blessed Redeemer offered up the atoning sacrifice of his blood, were bargained for and sold like beasts that perish; and when I regarded thee as the merchant in this dreadful traffic, and heard thee offer remarks, which might in some degree be considered as an apology for thy business, calling our attention to the cleanly state of the apartments, the wholesome provisions, &c., and especially when I heard thee declare that thou hadst been educated by a pious mother—that thou wast never addicted to swearing or other immoralities—and that thy business was a legalized one—that thou didst nothing contrary to law—and that, while in thy possession, the poor creatures were treated kindly—that families were not separated, &c.,—I was glad to perceive some evi-

dence that the nature of thy employment had not extinguished the voice of conscience within thee. In thy sentiments, and in the manner of their utterance, I thought I could see that truth had not left itself without a witness in thy breast, and that a sense of the wrongfulness of thy occupation still disturbed thee.

‘To thy remark that thy business was necessary to the system of slavery, and an essential part of it—and if slave-*holding* were to be justified at all, the slave-*trade* must be also—I certainly can offer no valid objection; for I have never been able to discover any moral difference between the planter of Virginia and the slave dealer of Baltimore, Richmond, and Washington. Each has *his part* to act in the system, and each is necessary to the other; and if the matter were not in all its bearings painfully serious, it would be amusing to witness the absurd contempt with which the slave owner of Maryland or Virginia professes to look upon the trader, whose purchase of his surplus slaves alone enables him to retain the residue in his possession; for it seems very evident that the only profitable part of the system in those states, at the present time, is the sale of the annual increase of the slaves.

‘In passing from thy premises, we looked in upon the *Triennial Convention of the Baptists of the United States*, then in session in the city of Baltimore, where I found slave-*holding* ministers, of high rank in the church, urging successfully the exclusion from the missionary board of that society of all those who, in principle and practice, were known to be decided abolitionists; and the results of their efforts satisfied me that the darkest picture of slavery is not to be found in the jail of the slave-trader, but rather in a convocation of professed ministers of the gospel of Christ expelling from the board of a society, formed to enlighten the heathen of other nations, all who consistently labour for the overthrow of a system which denies a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures to near three millions of heathen at home!

‘But allow me, in a spirit, as I trust, of Christian kindness, to entreat thee not to seek excuses for thy own course in the evil conduct of others. Thou hast already reached the middle period of life—the future is uncertain. By thy hopes of peace here and hereafter, let me urge thee to abandon this occupation. It is not necessary to argue its intrinsic wickedness, for thou knowest it already. I would, therefore, beseech thee to listen to that voice, which, I am persuaded, sometimes urges thee to ‘put away the evil of thy doings,’ to ‘do justice and love mercy,’ and *thus* cease to draw upon thyself the curse which fell upon those merchants of Tyre who ‘traded in the persons of men.’ That these warnings of conscience may not be longer neglected on thy part, is the sincere wish of one, who, while he abhors thy *occupation*, feels nothing but kindness and good will towards *thyself*.—pp. 32—35.

The Baptist Triennial Convention, referred to in the foregoing letter, has earned for itself an unenviable distinction in the history of such conventions, by excluding all known abolitionists from its missionary board. This was done by a majority of 124 to 117, and this too, after an intercourse of some years with the Baptists

of England and the reception of numerous expostulatory letters from them. It remains to be seen, whether the latter will continue a correspondence which, without effecting any beneficial change in the views of American Baptists, only involves in doubt the sincerity of those of England.

We have already had occasion to notice the declension which has taken place in the sentiments and conduct of the Society of Friends on the slavery question, and Mr. Sturge has furnished ample evidence of the fact, though he expresses a hope that 'a brighter day in regard to their labours is approaching.' He speaks on this subject with evident regret, but with his characteristic honesty. There is no attempt at concealment. The facts are recorded as he found them. The whole case, so far as it came under his observation, is stated; yet it is obvious to every reader that his heart was wrung with the bitterest grief at being compelled to bear testimony against his brethren. Their anti-slavery sentiments are represented as little more than matters of tradition, the inheritance received from their fathers, which has failed to exercise any vital and germinating power over their minds. 'I fear,' remarks Mr. Sturge, 'that in many cases they have not only done nothing themselves, but by example and precept have condemned the activity of others.' In the exercise of their right as electors, they are accustomed, with few exceptions, to give their vote without reference to the sentiments of the candidate on the subject of slavery. 'At the late presidential election it is very evident that the great body of Friends who took any part in it voted for John Tyler, the slave-holder.' So decided has been their defection from the spirit of their fathers, that for the last eight years 'the collective influence of the society has,' in our author's judgment, 'been thrown into the pro-slavery scale,' and this, too, notwithstanding the existence of much right feeling 'in the breasts of probably a large majority of individual members.' To the correction of this state of things Mr. Sturge addressed himself with his wonted activity and earnestness, and we cannot doubt that the fruit of his labours will yet be seen in the improved temper and greater activity of his brethren.

'I had several conferences with 'friends' who were interested in the cause, to discuss the best mode of engaging the members of the society to unite their efforts on behalf of the oppressed and suffering slaves; and though no immediate steps were resolved on, yet I found so much good feeling in many of them, that I cannot but entertain a hope that fruit will hereafter appear. I had spent much of my time and labour in Philadelphia, particularly among that numerous and influential class with whom I am united in a common bond of religious belief, and, I trust, of Christian affection. Of the kindness and hospitality I experienced I shall ever retain a grateful recollection; yet I finally took my

leave of this city under feelings of sorrow and depression that so many of the very class of Christian professors, who once took the lead in efforts for the abolition of slavery, efforts evidently attended with the favour and sanction of the Most High, should now be discouraging and holding back their members from taking part in so righteous a cause. Among the warmest friends of the slave, sound both in feeling and sentiment, are a few venerable individuals who are now standing on the brink of the grave, and whose places among the present generation, I could not conceal from myself, there were but few fully prepared to occupy. I had found in many friends much passive anti-slavery feeling, and was, to some extent, cheered by the discovery. May a due sense of their responsibility rest upon every follower of Christ, to remember them that are in bonds and under affliction, not only with a passive, but with an active and self-denying sympathy, a sympathy that makes common cause with its object.'—p. 95.

On the whole, the impression on our author's mind is that the state of the anti-slavery cause in America is decidedly hopeful. He does not attempt to conceal the facts which make against it, nor does he found his hopes on the fond wishes of a benevolent heart. He looks at things as they are, reasons calmly on the evidence of the case, and after comparing the influences which are at work, brings out the result which we have stated.

Mr. Sturge was deputed by the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to present to the President an address from the London Convention. For this purpose he repaired to Washington, and addressed a note to the President, stating the nature of the document with which he was entrusted, and requesting permission to present it. To this communication he received no reply, nor did the President allude to it on a subsequent occasion when our author was introduced to him. Amongst the celebrated men with whom he met at Washington was Henry Clay, of Kentucky, to whom Mr. Joseph John Gurney's Letters on the state of the West Indies were addressed. Of this gentleman a more extended notice is given than is common with our author, and we extract the passage as illustrative of the character and views of a man who occupies an important political position in the United States.

' I feel disinclined to take leave of Henry Clay without some animadversions, which, on the public character of a public man, I may offer without any breach of propriety. In early life, that is, in some part of the last century, he supported measures tending to the 'eradication of slavery' in Kentucky, and, at various periods since, he has indulged in cheap declamation against slavery, though he is not known to have committed himself by a solitary act of manumission. On the contrary, having commenced life with a single slave, he has industriously increased the number to upwards of seventy. As a statesman, his conduct on this question has been consistently pro-slavery. He

indefatigably negotiated for the recovery of fugitive slaves from Canada, when secretary of state, though without success. In the senate he successfully carried through the admission of Missouri into the Union, as a slave state. He has resisted a late promising movement in Kentucky in favour of emancipation; and, lastly, in one of his most elaborate speeches, made just before the late presidential election, the proceedings of the abolitionists were reviewed and condemned, and he utterly renounced all sympathy with their object. By way of apology for his early indiscretion, he observes, 'But if I had been then, or were *now*, a citizen of any of the planting states—the southern or south-western states—I should have opposed, and would continue to oppose, any scheme whatever of emancipation, gradual or immediate.'

'In this extract, and throughout the whole speech, slavery is treated as a pecuniary question, and the grand argument against abolition is the loss of property that would ensue. Joseph John Gurney, who appears to have been favourably impressed by Henry Clay's professions of liberality, his courteous bearing, and consummate address, manifested a laudable anxiety that so influential a statesman should be better informed on the point on which he seemed so much in the dark; he therefore addressed to him his excellent 'Letters on the West Indies,' of which the great argument is, that emancipation has been followed by great prosperity to the planters, and attended with abundant blessings, temporal and spiritual, to the other classes, and that the same course would necessarily be followed by the same results in the United States. He has accumulated proof upon proof of his conclusions, supplied by personal and extensive investigation in the British colonies. But Henry Clay shews no sign of conviction. Yet though he made to us the absurd remark, already quoted, on Joseph John Gurney's work, I have too high an opinion of his understanding to think him the victim of his own sophistry. He is a lawyer and a statesman; he is accustomed to weigh evidence, and to discriminate facts. I have little doubt that all my valued friend would have taught him, he knew already. He could not be ignorant of the contrast presented by his own state of Kentucky and the adjoining state of Ohio, and that the difference is solely owing to slavery. If J. J. Gurney could have shewn that abolition would soon be the high road to the president's chair, it is not improbable that he would have made an illustrious convert to anti-slavery principles. Henry Clay's celebrated speech, before alluded to, was delivered in the character of a candidate for the presidency just before the last election; it was prepared with great care, and rehearsed before-hand to a select number of his political friends. The whig party being the strongest, and he being the foremost man of that party, he might be looked upon as president-elect, if he could but conciliate the south by wiping off the cloud of abolitionism that faintly obscured his reputation. He succeeded to his heart's desire in his immediate object, but eventually, by this very speech, completely destroyed his sole chance of success, and was ultimately withdrawn from the contest. Thus does ambition overleap itself.'—pp. 81—83.

Mr. Sturge's testimony respecting the means of religious in-

struction, provided in the New England-states, is entirely accordant with other impartial witnesses. Speaking of the beautiful town of Worcester, he says: 'If the entire population were to go to a place of worship at the same hour in the same day, there would be ample accommodation and room to spare.' He subsequently remarks:—

'There are few things more striking in the free states than the number and commodiousness of the places of worship. In the New England states, however general the attendance might be, none would be excluded for want of room. The other means or accompaniments of religious instruction are in the same abundance. How is it possible to evade the conclusion, that Christianity flourishes most when it is unencumbered and uncorrupted by state patronage? What favoured portion of the United Kingdom could compare its religious statistics with New England?'—p. 173.

The facts which he witnessed, notwithstanding the deduction to be made on the score of slavery, strongly excited his admiration, and led to the conviction that there is no other country where the means of temporal happiness and of religious improvement are so abundantly possessed. And all this, it must be remembered, is effected without the compulsory measures to which resort is had in this country. No conscience is violated by the interposition of the state on behalf of a particular form of faith, nor are the pecuniary resources of one sect of religionists taxed to support the opinions and discipline of another. The great principle of personal responsibility in religious matters is distinctly recognised, and Christianity is, in consequence, found to wield much of the influence which, in primitive times, made the deities of Greece and Rome tremble before her. The great anomaly in the present condition of the American church is the support she yields to slavery. This is at once her weakness and her disgrace—a fact deeply to be deplored, yet easily to be accounted for. She has, in truth, grown up amidst the depraving influences of the system, and much of her energy has been expended in preventing society attaining that rank corruption to which such a system tends. Cramped in her energies, fettered in her speech, she is only just beginning to evidence a due appreciation of her position and duties. The change, however, has commenced, and we have sufficient faith in the sound-heartedness of American Christianity to believe, that it will proceed at a rapid pace to impregnate the public mind with enlightened and virtuous resolutions on this most momentous of all practical questions.

The northern states are greatly in advance of our own country in the matter of education. It may be regarded as nearly universal throughout the population; in proof of which,

we may mention that not a single American adult of the state of Connecticut was returned at the late census as unable to read or write. The funds needed for the support of their schools are raised by self-taxation in each town or district, and the instruction afforded is admitted on all hands to comprise everything requisite for a sound and practical education of the less affluent portion of the community. The following extract from a letter, addressed to Mr. Sturge, by a member of the Society of Friends, residing in Worcester, Massachusetts, gives an accurate idea of the diffusion and practical character of the education furnished:—

‘ The public schools of the place, like those throughout the state, are supported by a tax, levied on the people by themselves, in their primary assemblies or town meetings; and they are of so excellent a character, as to have driven other schools almost entirely out from amongst us. They are so numerous as to accommodate amply all the children, of suitable age to attend. They are graduated from the infant school, where the A. B. C. is taught, up to the high school for the languages and mathematics, where boys are fitted for the university, and advanced so far, if they choose, as to enter the university one or two years ahead. These schools are attended by the children of the whole population promiscuously; and, in the same class, we find the children of the governor and the ex-governor of the state, and those of their day labourers, and of parents who are so poor that their children are provided with books and stationery from the school fund. Under this system, we have no children who do not acquire sufficient school learning to qualify them for transacting all the business which is necessary in the ordinary pursuits of life. A child growing up without school learning would be an anomaly with us. All standing thus on a level as to advantages, talent is developed, wherever it happens to be; and neither wealth nor ancestral honours give any advantage in the even-handed contest which may here be waged for distinction. It is thus that we find, almost uniformly, that our first men, either in government or the professions, are the sons of comparatively poor and obscure persons. In places where the wealthier portion of the community have placed their children in select schools, they are found much less likely to excel, than when placed in contact and collision with the mass, where they are compelled to come in competition with those whose physical condition prepares them for mental labour, and whose situation in society holds forth every inducement to their exertions. To this system, which is coeval with the foundation of the state, I attribute, in a great degree, that wonderful energy of character which distinguishes the people of New England, and which has filled the world with the evidences of their enterprise.’—pp. 171, 172.

This representation refers only to one portion of the free states, and that the oldest. The more recently settled northern and western states, though necessarily less advanced, would not,

probably, suffer by a comparison of their educational statistics with those of Britain. The condition of the slave states, however, is vastly different. The curse of God rests upon them, as is seen in the ignorance, immorality, and wretchedness which everywhere abound. Virginia is one of the oldest of these states, and has probably expended far more than any other slave state upon her collegiate institution. Yet we are informed in the American Almanack for 1841, that there are nearly 30,000 adult white persons in Virginia who can neither read nor write. The contrast observable between the free and slave states, in the habits and intelligence of their people, is as striking as that which is exhibited in the general aspect of the two countries.

An interesting account is given of the Sing Sing state prison, which our author visited in company with Mr. Lewis Tappan. It is known, probably, to many of our readers, that in this celebrated institution, what is technically termed the *silent* system is established. This system, so far as we can judge of its working by the reports hitherto received, would seem to be free from the objections to which the *separate* system is liable, and to be powerfully conducive to the benevolent purposes for which punishment should be inflicted. The following extract will best exhibit the internal economy of the prison. It is taken from a letter addressed to Mr. Sturge from an English inmate:—

‘ After alluding to the absolute monotony of prison life, he gives one day as a specimen of every day:—‘ Monday morning, the large prison bell rings at five o'clock, when we all rise; half an hour after, we all go out to work, to our respective shops, till breakfast, the keepers all the time seated upon a high seat, overlooking—seeing that everything is ordered and going on in a proper manner: no talking allowed upon any occasion, or under any pretence whatever. When the breakfast bell rings, we all go in to breakfast, each one to a separate room (which are all numbered, one thousand in all): every man's breakfast is ready for him in his room,—one pint of coffee, with plenty of meat, potatoes, and rye bread. After one hour the prison opens again, and we work in a similar manner till twelve—dinner hour—when we go in again. Dinner is set ready as before,—an ample quantity of meat, potatoes, and bread, with a cup of water (the best beverage in the world—would to God I had never drank anything else, and I should not have been here!) One hour allowed for dinner, when we go out and work again till six o'clock, when we come in and are locked up for the night, with a large bowl of mush (hasty pudding with molasses), the finest food in the world, made from Indian meal. Thus passes each day of the week. Sundays we rise at the same hour. Each man has a clean shirt given him in his room, then goes to the kitchen, brings his breakfast in with him, the same as before, and is locked up till eight, when Divine service is performed by a most worthy and able chaplain. After service, through the pious and benevolent efforts of Mr. Seymour, we have an

excellent Sabbath school ; Bible classes, where from three to four hundred attend, about half to learn to read, and the others to receive instruction in the way to attain everlasting life, under the immediate inspection of Mr. Seymour ; and I am happy to say, that the greatest attention is paid by scholars of both classes. Many, very many, know how to appreciate the value of these privileges, and benefit by them accordingly. Mr. Seymour has obtained a large library for us, and one of the prisoners is librarian. At eleven o'clock we are locked up for the day, with an extra allowance of food and water sufficient. The librarian and an assistant are left open, to distribute the books ; that is, to go to each man's cell, get the book he had the previous Sunday, and give him another in exchange, generally supplying them with a small tract, of which we mostly have a great plenty.'

'A large proportion of the prisoners work in a stone quarry without the walls, and the most painful sight I saw at Sing Sing were the sentinels placed on prominent points commanding the prison, with loaded muskets and fixed bayonets, who have orders at once to shoot a convict who may attempt to escape, if he does not obey the order to return. I was told, however, an occurrence of the kind had not happened for years.'—pp. 132—134.

We had intended to transfer to our pages some portion of our author's account of the woollen and cotton manufactures of Lowell ; but, having already exceeded our limits, we must abstain from doing so. After what we have said, it will not be needful to give any formal recommendation of Mr. Sturge's volume, the details of which are so interesting, and the spirit so beautiful, as to render its perusal equally conducive to the pleasure and improvement of its readers. We thank him most heartily for the good service he has rendered, and cordially commend his volume to the immediate attention of our friends.

---

Art. V. 1. *The People's Charter.*

2. *Chartism.* By Thomas Carlyle. London : Fraser.
3. *Complete Suffrage the only effectual means of reconciliation between the Middle and Labouring Classes.* (From the 'Non-conformist' newspaper.)
4. *Chartism : a new Organization of the People, embracing a Plan for the Education of the People, politically and socially.* Written in Warwick Jail, by William Lovett, Cabinet-maker, and John Collins, Tool-maker. Second Edition. London : 1841.

IT might seem, at first sight, matter of astonishment that so wide a difference of opinion should exist upon political subjects between thinking and intelligent men of the same country. Were the subject one which involved much of abstruse and metaphysical reasoning, that surprise would certainly be dimin-

ished. Amidst the solitude and the darkness of those regions of thought, the fewness of the landmarks, and the feebleness of the lights ;—in the absence, in a word, of any recognised data, it is not so surprising that men should lose themselves and one another. But the principles of political philosophy are such as come home to every man's business and bosom. A vague and indeterminate character confessedly belongs to all theories which relate to abstract science, and equally to the remoter and less illuminated points of theological inquiry. Nothing of this kind, however, attaches to anything which is essential to the well-being of man. In religion, in morals, in politics, the leading, if not the only essential truths, may be simply stated and easily understood ; and in political science, especially, which chiefly regards the interests of men in those aspects which are daily presented to our notice, the great principles are so obvious and so determinate, that the wide differences which separate and characterize political parties offer a subject of very curious and interesting reflection.

It may further seem somewhat remarkable, that these discordant notions have not reference in general to those branches of political philosophy which are of a more abstract and recondite nature ; nor are they chiefly entertained by men, whose intellectual habits lead them to the outer regions of thought, where truth and error dispute a dubious frontier. On the contrary, we find them pervading the commonest and most every-day interests of society, and distinguishing into hostile parties, men who seldom give themselves the trouble of thinking their way beyond the limits of certain and absolute knowledge. The commonest political rights of men, whether as members of civil society, or as subjects of a higher empire,—the proper methods of embodying and exercising those rights, the commercial regulations which are essential to a mixed and civilized system of society, the rights of territorial possession, the system of jurisprudence and of international law ;—all these momentous matters, which one might have thought that the recorded experience of ages would have settled in minds progressively enlightened amidst that experience, are still the subjects of hot and hostile discussion—a discussion so hot and so hostile, as to threaten the repeal of that benign law which would bind society into unity.

Whence, then, this apparent anomaly ? We think it may be accounted for by one cardinal principle, and thence by a few subordinate considerations. Political philosophy is the philosophy of mankind ; it springs alone from the rights of society, and tends alone to their interests. And there is a high sense in which the language of Pope is perfectly just, that

‘ True self love and social are the same ;’

yet it must be obvious, that these great principles are very commonly disregarded, inasmuch as the consciousness of abstract political truth is complicated with the more proximate, and, therefore, the more powerful sense of individual interest. This we take to be the great evil, and thus we may dispose of at least so much of the difficulty which we have suggested as respects the unreflecting habits of those who constitute these opposite political parties. Among the subsidiary considerations which deserve our notice, are the following:—First, the prevalence of that unphilosophical habit of mind, which distrusts and fears to follow the dictates of reason and of truth. The present advantage, which is practically felt, overbears by its influence any which may be ever so clearly ascertained, whether by reason or experience. Just as in the physical system the section of an acorn placed close to the eye, will conceal hundreds of acres of venerable oak, so in the moral system (on those great principles of analogy which point to a single Being as the founder of both,) a proximate and seeming advantage will, by means of its very proximity, hide from the vision the vaster good which, in the arrangements of Providence, lies more remote.

A second and more palpable reason may be found, in the thoughtless habit of society, of identifying great causes with their more conspicuous advocates. No new principle can be introduced into the social mind, whether it be gently insinuated by argument, or abruptly plunged into it by moral or physical force, without producing an eddy, which, by the commonest laws, presents at its surface what is generally the lightest and most worthless. To the truth of this remark, universal history bears its testimony, uniform and distinct; nor is there a clearer evidence of the unthinking superficiality of popular observation than is afforded by this principle as daily actualized before us. In all the great revolutions which have affected society, no circumstance has more retarded the production of beneficial results than the identification of the cause with certain individuals who happen to be forward in its promotion. Thus the subordinate founders of Christianity itself were stamped with the *deepest* disgrace by the epithet of Nazarenes; and thus among those whom fear has made frantic, or whom despotic principles have blinded, the name of Robespierre is conjured up to anathematize the great movement which in the last century took its origin in France.

A third and last popular fallacy, consequent upon those which have been already indicated, may be found in the prepossessions on the one hand, and the prejudices on the other, which attach to mere names, not indeed of persons but of things. It seems as if it were yet to be learned that such names in the political system, like coins in the monetary, are but counters, the compara-

tively empty symbols of important realities. On the one hand, we have 'our glorious constitution,' 'existing institutions,' 'vested interests,' and the '*juste milieu*.' On the other hand, we have 'revolution,' 'radicalism,' 'political dissenterism,' and last, perhaps not least—CHARTISM.

We take up the last-mentioned subject—that of Chartism, as affording the aptest illustration which we can bring of the unhappy tendency of all the popular fallacies which we have thus briefly pointed out. Its very name, to begin with the last suggestion that we made, is identified in the minds of the large proportion of the middle, moderate, and moral class of society, with all that is frightful in rebellion, confiscation, and anarchy. No word, since *Jacobin* of earlier date, and *Bony* in later times, has occasioned half so much trepidation among elderly ladies and children. There is nothing bad, and black, and wicked, with which it has not been associated. We shall presently endeavour to shew how much is contained in this dreaded name to justify such alarms.

But, to go back to our second suggestion of popular fallacies, there is another, and that a very large class, who identify the principles of Chartism with certain individuals who find their interest in connecting themselves with the cause. Now nothing in our most convinced judgment can be more true, than that some of the most worthless and unprincipled men in this country stand identified with the cause of Chartism. A few who have small capital and *large expectations*, without a ray of patriotic feeling, and with the scantiest knowledge of the principles involved in their enterprise, have united themselves with the party-coloured thing which is called Chartism. No warning voice of ours can be too loud, no language too strong, to deter the thinking but suffering classes of this country from identifying themselves with these reckless and shameless men, who would fain be their leaders. Bankrupt alike in character and fortune, they seek to patch up the miserable remnants of selfishness with the badges conferred by popular delusion. Careless of all interests but their own, they find their account in misleading the multitude whom ignorance on the one hand, and privation on the other, are inviting to desire change for its own sake. The influence thus exerted by unprincipled adventurers upon unthinking minds, presents, in our opinion, one of the most serious barriers against all enlightened and substantial reform. Happily for those who wisely appreciate the rights of their fellow-countrymen, and deeply sympathize with their wrongs, they are not compelled, in consistency, to identify themselves with such men as these.

And then, again, to retrace our steps still further, there is no

subject to which our first observation more fully applies than to this. In our mixed and artificial state of society, the great principles upon which the social compact is based, and the correlative rights and duties springing out of that compact, are as nearly as possible lost sight of. Every class (except, indeed, the lowest) has its class interests. The tendency to monopoly of political power is but the type of corresponding tendencies, with better objects, in the subordinate ranks. Hence our system of national religion is no less artificial than it is intolerant, and hence, too, together with the things they designate, the new words with which, like inarticulate cries, expressed by the torture of the times, we are learning to be familiar—aristocracy, artocracy, landocracy, shopocracy, hierarchy, and squirearchy.

The present condition of public affairs must, at least, have the effect of interrupting this lethargy. A pressure, stronger than any of a merely mental and abstract kind, is compelling the attention of society from the conventional to the primary and essential. It is driving us perforce to desist from the mere treatment of symptoms, and coercing us to an examination of the radical seat of social disease. A state of things has occurred in the political world, which, like a series of disasters in commercial concerns, has drawn us from the every-day routine of business, to a searching examination of our affairs. It is to the principles of political science, and not to the ordinary details of political life, that the attention of society is now imperatively demanded. A rapidly increasing population, and a decreasing demand for their labour; a crushing debt, and a diminished revenue; foreign markets virtually closed, and home markets thinned and impoverished; the vast majority of our population denied a voice in that legislature, which is the sole source from which the remedy can flow, and yet daily improving in enlightenment, education, and morals, and, consequently, in that vital and irresistible spirit which aggravates the sense of social degradation—*here* we have a combination of circumstances which summons away our attention from the ordinary workings of the political engine to a searching inspection of its structure.

Hence the political theory known by the new name of Chartism. As a system, it is new only in its name, its organization, and its energies. Its principles are as old as the theory of representation and the science of political philosophy. It is these principles, apart from the particular organization in which they have been embodied, and from the spirit in which they have been carried out, which we now design to develop.

The framers and supporters of the proposed parliamentary enactment, entitled, 'The Charter,' conceive that the oppressive evils which afflict society proceed almost wholly from a system of

class legislation. They clearly perceive that the barriers in the way of popular freedom, of liberty of conscience, of commercial success, and of financial reform, are the creation of acts of parliament, and that as these acts have called them into existence, so the exertion of the same authority may at any time remove and destroy them. They perceive, at the same time, that the controlling power of the legislature is possessed by a class who are personally interested in the maintenance of these abuses, under which the mass of their countrymen are suffering. Hence, on practical grounds, they demand the dissipation of this pernicious monopoly, and the introduction of all classes into that legislature, by whose enactments the interests and the destinies of all are greatly affected, and those of the unrepresented in particular, are arbitrarily determined.

They equally vindicate this claim on theoretical grounds. They maintain that the system of representation involves, as its essential and fundamental principle, the right of all who are called on to obey the laws to a voice in the legislature—of all who pay to the support of the state to a controlling power in the distribution of public revenues. They argue, that all who are denied this primary and indisputable right, except on grounds purely unavoidable, and which arise out of the very constitution of society, are thereby stigmatized as a degraded class, and exposed to all the unmerited sufferings which a system of uncontrolled domination never fails to inflict.

Now, in all this, there is nothing new; these are the principles which in all times have been held even by the wisest and most temperate advocates of popular rights. That the people are the source of all legitimate power, has ever been held as a sacred canon of politics by all who have not been prepared to go to the very extremes of despotism. Nor, indeed, is it possible to assign a limit short of those extremes, if once we quit the high ground of this elemental principle. The same considerations which would lead to the limitation of political power to one-half society, might, at another, contract it to one-tenth, one-thousandth, or even to the smallest fractional oligarchy. On such a point, all appeal to authority is obviously superfluous, else the advocates of such notions might refer with some degree of pride to the memorable words of Mr. Fox, who is surely placed above the reach of that vulgar censure which is pretty freely distributed to *them*—‘Representation is the sovereign remedy for every political evil.’ Nor are these theoretical opinions at all more novel than those of a more practical kind. ‘Taxation (says Lord Chatham), without representation, is tyranny;’ and Judge Blackstone himself, whom, perhaps, some may regard as a higher authority, has left us the following sentence, in his cele-

brated 'Commentaries':—'No subject of England can be constrained to pay any aids or taxes, even for the defence of the realm or the support of the government, but such as are imposed by his own consent, or that of his representative in parliament.'

These, then, are the fundamental principles of that much misunderstood document, 'The People's Charter.' We say much misunderstood, for we firmly believe that not one in a hundred, even of sober and thoughtful persons, who view the Charter with alarm, have ever taken the trouble to read it. Its preamble is as follows:—

'Whereas, to ensure, in as far as it is possible by human forethought and wisdom, the just government of the people, it is necessary to subject those who have the power of making the laws to a wholesome and strict responsibility to those whose duty it is to obey them when made;

'And whereas this responsibility is best enforced through the instrumentality of a body which emanates directly from, and is itself immediately subject to, the whole people, and which completely represents their feelings and their interests;

'And whereas, as the Commons' House of Parliament now exercises, in the name and on the supposed behalf of the people, the power of making the laws, it ought, in order to fulfil with wisdom and with honesty the great duties imposed on it, to be made the faithful and accurate representation of the people's wishes, feelings, and interests;

'Be it therefore enacted, That from and after the passing of this act, every male inhabitant of these realms be entitled to vote for the election of a member of parliament, subject, however, to the following conditions:—'

Between the quiet faith of some in these principles, and the stolid indifference of others, little has been heard of them, *in this country*, since the last great effort for the increase of representation. Recently, however, they have been revived, and subjected to the test of the most searching and yet the most candid scrutiny, in one of the tracts named at the head of this article, and entitled, 'Complete Suffrage,' &c. It consists of a series of articles, which have appeared successively in the pages of the 'Nonconformist' newspaper. They constitute one of the most purely philosophical dissertations which has ever come before us on such a subject and within such a compass. The writer disputes his way, inch by inch, from the most elementary axioms of political science, with a frankness and fearlessness in excellent moral correspondence with the justness and catholicity of his views. It is written with masterly power and with great simplicity; and deserves, and even demands, the attentive perusal of every man who is interested (as who is not?) in the momentous questions which at this solemn crisis are appealing to the universal intellect and heart of this empire.

We have already said, that the principle that all legitimate power must spring originally from the governed, is fundamental in every free country, and certainly essential to the theory of representation. Against its application lies an objection too hackneyed to be traced to any individual author, but which was pompously delivered by Dr. Johnson in his defence of the American war, entitled, 'Taxation no Tyranny,' and more elaborately developed by Mr. Burke in his *Reflections on the French Revolution*. It is to the effect, that men sacrifice their natural rights by incurring the protection of the social compact; that this protection is the equivalent for the sacrifice; and hence, in the elegant language of Mr. Burke, that 'abstract rights, applied to the conduct of civil society, are like rays of light penetrating into a dense medium, which become reflected from their original direction.' The treatment of this objection in the articles now under consideration is equally ingenious and conclusive.

'When (says the writer) man enters into a conventional state, and gives up independence with a view to protection, a tacit compact, we take it, is effected between the several members of society, considered as individuals, and society itself, considered in its collective capacity.

'He passes away from a state of unitude (if we may coin a word to express our meaning with precision) into a state of aggregation, as a means to an end—that end comprehending all the advantages arising from social order. Government is his creature, framed exclusively for his benefit; and invested with powers delegated by himself, to answer purposes essential to his welfare.

'I give you authority that you may give me protection,' is the true interpretation of the maxim that 'the people are the only legitimate source of power.' Now a compact supposes that, whatever else we concede to the covenanting party, we do not and cannot part with the ultimate right to see that the conditions of the agreement are fulfilled. That must remain with us; for the very essence of a bargain resides in the right of each party to demand the fulfilment of its terms. To government it belongs to define allegiance; to us it belongs to define protection. We have clearly a right to demand that the thing for which we invest the state with power, be performed by the state—and of the fidelity of the state to its trust, we reserve to ourselves the right of exercising judgment.

'We reserve it—it is not bestowed upon us by government—it belongs to us irrespectively of all conventional laws; for without it conventionalism is a mere contradiction, and the doctrine that government is either *from* the people or *for* them is a sheer absurdity!

'Here then, we have one right enjoyed by men in society, having its foundations deeper than society itself—the right of claiming from the state, that it accomplish the ends for which it was originally constituted, and of judging for themselves whether it has accomplished them or no. But this right infers another. It infers that they retain

the power to give expression to that judgment, and that such expression becomes a component element of the influence by which government is ultimately controlled. When the right remains with us to demand, the right to enforce the demand is presupposed, and is checked only by the higher laws of morality and religion. But subject to such checks, there is but one conceivable method of giving to our judgment a practical authority—namely, that of allowing it a fair representation in the national councils.

'The right, consequently, to be part and parcel of the government which exists *for us*, and whose power is power delegated to it by ourselves; in other words, the right to enforce our view of its obligations by proxy—i. e., to have our voice in the election of those who are to determine upon what is or what is not protection, is evidently antecedent to all conventional arrangement, and must stand or fall with the maxim with which we started, 'that the people are the only legitimate source of power.'

This reasoning, we say, we consider to be conclusive—we search in it in vain for a fallacy or a sophism; yet it involves (though probably not as its *specific* design) all the essential principles of the Charter; and though the writer was probably actuated by far higher and more catholic motives, we are convinced that any differences which may subsist between his views and those expressed in that document will solely have respect to details. It is unnecessary that we should pledge ourselves to that measure, but we hold it to be due from those who demur to these arguments, to reply to them in the same spirit of unfactious simplicity and moderation of which this writer has set them so excellent an example.

In support of the general principle thus laid down—that is, of the right of the people at large to the widest extension of political rights which the nature of the case allows, and which is consistent with the integral maintenance of the claims of all classes, we shall take leave to add one or two suggestions.

In the first place, then, it should be considered that every individual to whom it is proposed to extend the right of suffrage, pays his quota to the revenue of his country. It is not only rates and taxes which constitute this payment;—every man who consumes exciseable articles—every man who purchases tea or sugar, beer or spirits, tobacco or physic, or even bread, pays, *pro tanto*, to the revenue of the country. The power, therefore, of regulating the distribution of the funds thus raised would seem to belong to him as a natural right; and if, on any grounds of alleged expediency, that power is withheld from him and vested in a privileged class, that class, whether large or small, is placed under the heavy, and, to every sensitively just and benevolent mind, the distressing responsibility of holding in its hands the dearest inter-

ests of multitudes of his fellow-subjects, and that too accompanied with the harassing recollection that the parties for whom he is virtually acting never reposed in him one iota of that trust. Let any well-informed man cast his eye over the comparatively scanty numbers who elect the legislature of this empire. Let him observe their notorious ignorance, venality, and vice. We will not ask him whether he thinks them competent to legislate for their own political and social interests, but let him ask himself whether they are qualified to *hold in trust* those of the unrepresented millions of their countrymen. We will leave to the political casuist the question whether under such circumstances any individual of the privileged class has a right to exercise his suffrage at all, but we can imagine what would be the feelings of a thoughtful and honourable man if, on his way to the poll, he should be accosted by some score or two of his intelligent, respectable, but unrepresented neighbours, with such words as these : ' You are about, sir, to perform an act far more deeply involving our interests than your own : you are about to legislate for our lives, our liberties, and that which stands us in the stead of property, the management of which is denied to us, and never committed by us to your care. Recollect the solemnity of that appeal which is thus made to your knowledge, your wisdom, and your integrity ; lay to your heart the truth, that the condition of our wives and children is dependent upon the course you take ; and if you have never deeply thought of all that affects those interests, go back to your home, and tremble to deal with the dearest welfare of those whom accident has made your constituents *in all but the power to constitute you.*'

Indeed, the very rationale of representation lies in the freedom of the represented to elect, and, within certain limits, to control their representative ; and the only hypothesis upon which the millions of this country can be regarded otherwise than as vassals is, that they are virtually represented by the existing constituency. Where, then is their voice, their control, their remotest influence upon the existing constituency, even supposing that it were not as venal and as corrupt as it is,—seeing that *their* possession of the electoral right is dependent upon the most accidental circumstances of property and residence, with which the unrepresented cannot by possibility have any concern whatever ? Moreover, the supposed hypothesis proceeds upon the admission that the interests of the represented and the unrepresented are identical. This in hypothesis looks fair and philosophical, and on the great scale and in the long run it is unquestionably true ; but practically, and under existing circumstances, the interests of these classes are anything but identical. We appeal to the experience of every day—to the exorbitant influence of capital, and the depressed value of labour

—we appeal to the laws affecting the bequest of property, which oppress the poor beneficiary with heavy and exorbitant imposts while in proportion to the riches of the testator the duty becomes less and less. We need not particularize the multitude of instances in our system of taxation in which the rate of payment decreases, as for example, in the case of the window tax, in proportion to the extent to which the taxable article is used; and still less to those, in which the superfluities of opulence are imported duty free, while an immense revenue is extorted from the commonest necessities of poverty. We need not point to the detestable laws affecting the importation of corn and provisions—to the game laws, and the thousand other enormities, which aggrandize the resources of the rich at the expense of the earnings of the poor. Can any candid mind inspect our fiscal system—for we will not here touch upon our ecclesiastical economy—without admitting at the first glance, that it was manifestly constructed *by* the rich, and directed *against* the interests of the poor. On these two grounds we contend, that those to whom the franchise has not yet been extended are no more represented virtually than they are directly; and that if not socially, at least politically, they are but the helots of Great Britain.

But it is now time to bring forward and to examine the arguments by which the opponents of popular rights seek to justify the present system of incomplete and exclusive suffrage. Before doing so, it is only necessary to indicate in few words the limits to which the right is proposed to be extended by the Charter and by the 'Nonconformist,' in the series of essays to which we have referred above, and which are at this time occupying to no small extent the attention of the liberal community. The qualifications of an elector defined by the Charter are as follows:—

1. That he be a citizen of these realms.
2. That he be twenty-one years of age.
3. That he has not been declared insane by jury.
4. That he has not been convicted of felony.
5. That he has not been convicted of bribery at elections, or of personation, or forgery of election certificates.

One of the subsequent provisions, however, of the same proposed bill, is a system of annual and accurate registration, founded upon a continuous residence of at least three months, and available solely in the parish in which it is made. Let us now hear the limitations more argumentatively and elaborately laid down by the 'Nonconformist':—

1. Protection and allegiance, or, in other words, political power and submission to the law are correlatives. If governments are not in justice entitled to demand obedience when they cease to afford the

protection to society for which they were established, so, on the other hand, subjects who have thrown off their allegiance, and stand convicted by a legal tribunal of an infraction of the laws of their country, forfeit all claims to a control over national affairs.

‘ The compact is broken. The culprit, having kicked against the good order of society, is rightly excluded from a participation of its privileges; otherwise the very end of government is lost in the means by which it is sought to be attained, and organized society becomes impossible. Here, then, we have the first limitation of the proposed right—not capricious, but reasonable and self-evident. The possession of the franchise presupposes a uniform submission to the law of the land, and every man legally convicted of crime forfeits thenceforth his title to the suffrage. Let us hear no more, therefore, of the votes of honest men being swamped by those given by the refuse of society, the sweepings of our gaols and houses of correction. Let us not do the industrious classes wrong. They never claimed this at our hands; they are neither so foolish nor so wicked.

‘ 2. Political power and personal independence must stand or fall together. This is no new doctrine. Our forefathers recognised it. Feudal serfs they excluded from the franchise, and, practically, none but feudal serfs. Meanwhile, every one must admit that parties, whose actions are under the legal control of others, who in the eye of the law are not their own masters, free to choose their own occupation and enjoy for themselves the proceeds of their own labour, can hardly be invested with the responsibility of the franchise. This limitation excludes all minors and paupers. Not until the age of twenty-one years does a man in this country attain to the station of an independent freeman; and when dependent upon the resources of society, so as to take from, instead of adding to, the general stock, as in the case of the recipients of parish relief, he may be regarded as foregoing his independence. A receiver of public money, for which no equivalent return is made, clearly has no right to a voice in the imposition of taxes. He pays nothing to the state. He is himself an incumbrance upon it. He cannot equitably claim, therefore, to have any control over its movements.

‘ 3. The right to the suffrage clearly supposes that society, or, in other words, government, the organ of society, shall be able to identify us as being whom and what we profess to be. Innumerable frauds would else be the consequence. Vagrants, foreigners, and criminals, whose term of punishment had expired, might hurry from polling-place to polling-place, and sweep away the real sense of the constituents by fictitious votes. Out of this danger arises the necessity of associating the franchise with a local habitation, and with such a term of residence as may prove an effectual guarantee against fraudulent proceedings. Such a guarantee is afforded by six months’ residence in the district within which the voter claims to record his vote. It matters nothing to the state whether the party be a householder or a lodger. In either case he tells society his whereabouts, and furnishes the opportunity of proving or disproving his own statement respecting

himself. This would render necessary an annual registration; and the arrangement might be rendered perfect by a provision, that each individual should be registered, and should vote within the parish in which he resides.'

These, then, are the principal arguments by which the right of the unrepresented to political power is defended, and if sound, they obviously involve the sacred duty of all who possess the franchise to extend it to the proposed limits. For ourselves, we candidly confess that we see no fallacy in this process of reasoning. We believe that it never has been met fairly, and that it never can be successfully: at all events, we shall wait to hear it controverted with all the patience which the nature of the case admits.

Though, however, these abstract positions have never been satisfactorily controverted, they have been indirectly opposed by two considerations founded upon grounds of political expediency, which, from the extended currency they have obtained, demand some degree of attentive examination. The first of these is—that the 'lower orders,' as they have been denominated since the days of Mr. Pitt, are incapacitated by their ignorance for the exercise of their political rights, and that this fact bars the application of those arguments which otherwise it would be impossible to resist. Now we can readily admit the sad extent and the wretched results of popular ignorance, and we are at as little loss upon whom to charge the weighty responsibility of perpetuating that ignorance, and of using it with all its subsidiary forces for their own corrupt and indefensible purposes. Naturally enough, this consideration is urged by those who have found their own account in the ignorance and degradation of the mass of the people; who have found in the thick mists of the popular mind a fitting atmosphere to cover their nefarious purposes. Very much, however, of this allegation is palpably untrue, while much of it that is true is irrelevant to the question.

We contend, in the first place, that with all the admitted disparity which subsists, and perhaps ever will subsist, between the higher and lower classes of society, in learning, refinement, and taste, there is no such disparity with relation to those habits of observation and reflection which enable the mind to judge rightly on general political subjects. In this matter, we are convinced that extreme injustice is done to what are called the lower classes. To pass over the vast proportion of instances in which poverty and original obscurity has been illustrated by genius and learning, as compared with the examples, few and far between, of intellectual distinction in the aristocracy, we believe that we are computing most moderately when we ascribe to the

lower class habits of observation and reflection, and a sound judgment on subjects falling within the range of those faculties, fully equal to those evinced by the classes more favoured by fortune.

2. Were this not the case, we contend that the supposed deficiency of talent and information in the humbler ranks of society would afford no ground for withholding the electoral franchise. The most important subjects which can affect the interests of mankind, are proverbially the simplest. It is only the pettiness of detail which is perplexing; the massy vastness of fundamental principles may be apprehended by the most untutored perceptions; such are, for example, the principles of religion and of morals. The pious poor may indeed be unable to twine the 'cob-web rope' of polemics; but we verily believe that there are many among them who understand more clearly the sublime doctrines of Christianity than all the bench of bishops put together. So the uninstructed, but sober-minded labourer, may be unable (in common with his priest, perhaps,) to entertain the more metaphysical difficulties of moral science; whilst, by the light of a simple intellect and an unsophisticated conscience, he steers securely to that point which casuistry never reached. And so with those important questions on which the constituent has to form that opinion which regulates his vote,—it is not necessary to master the evidence connected with chancellors' budgets, or railway and turnpike acts. A few great but distinct subjects, from time to time, occupy the public mind. Take the last twenty years—the repeal of the civil disabilities affecting protestant dissenters and catholics, the reform of the representation, the abolition of slavery, the mitigation of a sanguinary criminal code, the freedom of trade, the dissipation of monopolies, and the reform of municipal corporations. Now what, we inquire, is necessary to the formation of a correct judgment on such subjects, over and above that information on matters of fact supplied by newspapers, and thence carried by social intercourse to the extremes of society? We contend that nothing is requisite but the plainest common sense, habits of sober thought, and that honesty which, whatever may be the case among the lower classes, among the higher is rarer than either.

Upon this question, the writer from whom we have already quoted offers some considerations too striking to be omitted, and which cannot be better submitted to the reader than in his own condensed language:—

'When,' says he, 'the ignorance of the labouring classes is urged as a sufficient plea for withholding from them the franchise, it is tacitly assumed that, under the present restricted system, affairs of state are

mainly settled by the intelligence of our constituencies, are discussed with fairness, and decided upon according to their merits. Now the very reverse of all this is matter of notoriety. The middle class constituency has done anything but prove its peculiar and exclusive fitness for political power. Is the last general election, we ask, to be regarded as an expression of their intelligence? Are we to look to that, as affording an illustration of the decision of national affairs by argument and reason? Are tenants at will invariably swayed by the simple merits of the question? Do our tradesmen take into serious consideration the destiny of unborn myriads?

'And when the accomplished senators selected by the educated middle classes are assembled in council, where are we to find the proofs of their superiority to clamour and prejudice? They discuss matters, it is true;—but does discussion, on an average, influence one vote throughout a session? Party considerations decide everything—political principles are only the bones over which they fight for mastery. What are the real merits of a question to the well-trained gangs who flock at the sound of the division bell, to vote upon matters of incalculable importance, from the discussion of which they have absented themselves?

'The matter, however, need not be treated as one of mere speculation. Look back upon the past ten years. The masses, even under the most disadvantageous circumstances, have evinced their sentiments upon the leading topics of policy which during that time have agitated the nation. Have they sided with ignorance, or with intelligence? with justice, or with injustice? with selfishness, or with generosity? Reformers are the last persons who ought to plead the ignorance of the industrious classes as a bar to their political elevation, for these classes have invariably given their voice for reformers, until the principles of reform were merged in party encounter. We aver, without fear of contradiction, that popular opinion has, during the whole of the reform era, been invariably right—has invariably coincided with reason—inevitably sympathized with equity—and, even in those matters wherein they differ with the middle classes, we should like to be informed on which side the strongest arguments may be found, and on which the most unreasoning prejudice? That their sentiments have been violently expressed we admit, and we deplore; but let us remember, that we allow them no *legitimate* mode of giving effect to the opinions they entertain.

'Lastly, the objection leaves a vast deal of truth out of sight. It does not bring into view, as it ought, that we of the middle class practically regard it as destitute of force. We are constantly over-riding our own objection. We do believe, whatever we may allege to the contrary, that the industrious classes are competent to take rational views of leading political matters. Whenever we wish to carry a question, we address ourselves to them—we argue, we appeal, we illustrate, we supply information, without any notion that they are incapable of discerning truth. We organize them into societies; we make demonstrations of their unanimity; we encourage them to display their mind, with a view to influence the mind of the senate. All this proves

that we do not regard them as incompetent to deal with national affairs. Now since we practically appeal to their suffrage, it is too late to urge, when they claim to be allowed to embody it in a vote, that they are not sufficiently intelligent. We admit their intelligence when we address ourselves to the task of laying before them requisite information, when we ask their verdict ; and having obtained it, plead that verdict as an argument in our own favour. If the labouring classes are not sufficiently intelligent to vote, neither are they to be formed into associations, neither are they to sign petitions ; and when we use them in these latter cases, we cut the throat of our own objection in reference to the suffrage.'

This is bold thinking and forcible writing ; but, however successful it may be in destroying the objection against which it is directed, it by no means sets the question at rest. A second, and, we think, the only surviving argument, rises upon the ruins of the former. While by many it will be freely admitted that there is no such incapacity of comprehension among the unrepresented masses of society as incapacitates them for the exercise of the franchise, it will still be contended by many that they are morally disqualified for the functions of constituency by their dishonesty, and their easy liability to bribery and intimidation. Now this is certainly a formidable objection, since the very theory of representation presupposes the independence of the voter. At all events, it calls for a fearless and full examination.

It should be recollected, then, that the independence, involved as an essential in the theory of representation, is obviously a possible, and not a real and necessary independence. Hence, on the one hand, the political distinctions of age and sex. It is supposed, that the position in the social system occupied by women is such as necessarily to preclude, in the vast majority of instances, a perfect independence of political action. On the same principle, the suffrage has ever been limited to those who have attained the age of majority, as settled by common law. Yet while the theory itself thus excludes those who are *necessarily* dependent, it by no means shuts out such as are *possibly* or *casually* so. We would just beg the reader to imagine what would be the limits of the electoral right, were all those to be disfranchised who are open to temptation of corrupt influence, or who actually yield to it? The notoriously venal character of the existing constituent body most assuredly forbids the application of this sweeping test to the unrepresented classes of society.

But, again, even were the allegation true, which is commonly and most unsparingly made against the unenfranchised millions, the argument deduced from it would still, we think, be untenable. Even upon this supposition, we think that the tendency of a measure which should liberally throw open the avenues to po-

itical influence, would be to diminish rather than to augment the amount of venality and corruption. Of this, indeed, we have a practical proof before us, in the operation of the reform act. The class which it introduced to the possession of the suffrage are found to be at least as venal as any who could be enfranchised, even under the charter itself; insomuch that it has recently been asserted in both houses of parliament, and that without the slightest attempt at contradiction, that the result of the last nominal appeal to the people has been entirely determined by the purses of the aristocracy. Yet still it is equally notorious, that the amount expended in elections is very far—perhaps even proportionately less. As a single illustration of this, the writer was informed by the late Earl of Durham, that his lordship's last election for his own county cost him no less than *sixty-four thousand pounds*, while his successor obtained his seat at *less than a tenth of that expense*.

But, apart from this, we are persuaded that, with every allowance that can be made, the charge we are opposing involves a groundless, an insulting, and a most dishonourable calumny. We are persuaded, that the ratio of moral excellence has ever been greatly in favour of the poorer classes of society. Base and feculent as the morals of the masses have become, from the sediment incessantly precipitated from the vices of the aristocracy, and surrounded, in addition, with the temptations peculiarly incident to their condition, we believe that there resides and flourishes among them a degree of genuine virtue which their supercilious oppressors have scanty means of knowing, and which, did they know it, they would be still less qualified to appreciate. We are persuaded that the history of our country, and especially the experience of modern times, proves indisputably, that concessions made by constituted power to the rights of the people have been received in a spirit alike exemplary and encouraging—in a spirit which befits men distinguished at once by the sense of gratitude and the spirit of freedom. Assuredly we cannot wonder at the suspicions of them entertained by many, seeing that the oppression under which they have long been suffering is enough to 'make wise men mad,' and almost to suggest the appeal to physical force as the only remedy. Yet we are convinced that the number of the unrepresented who would seriously contemplate such a course is too small to excite apprehension or to deserve notice. On this subject let us listen to the voice from Warwick Gaol. It emanates from two working men, smarting under the penalty of a political offence, and who have chosen to occupy the hours of their solitude in the composition of a work, which for power of thought and diction, and for philanthropy of

spirit, would not disgrace a far loftier origin. In referring to their unenfranchised brethren, they say:—

‘We are now satisfied, that many of them experience more acute sufferings, and daily witness worse scenes of wretchedness, than sudden death can possibly inflict, or battle-strife disclose to them. For what worse can those experience on earth, who from earliest morn to latest night are toiling in misery, yet starving while they toil ? who, possessing all the anxieties of fond parents, cannot satisfy their children with bread ? who, susceptible of every domestic affection, perceive their hearths desolate, and little ones neglected, while the wives of their bosoms are exhausting every toiling faculty, in the field or workshop, to add to the scanty portion, which merely serves to protect their lives of careworn wretchedness ? Men thus steeped in misery, and standing on the very verge of existence, cannot philosophize on prudence ; they are disposed to risk their lives on any chance which offers the prospect of immediate relief, as the only means of rendering life supportable, or helping them to escape death in its most agonizing forms. When we further reflect on the circumstances which have hitherto influenced the great mass of mankind, we are not surprised at the feeling that prevails in favour of physical force. When we consider their early education, their school-book heroes, their historical records of military and naval renown, their idolized warriors of sea and land, their prayers for conquest, and thanksgivings for victories,—and the effect of all these influences to expand their combative faculties, and weaken their moral powers, we need not wonder that men generally place so much reliance on physical force, and undervalue the superior force of their reason and moral energies. Experience, however, will eventually dispel this delusion, and will cause reformers to hold in reserve the exercise of the former, till the latter has been proved ineffectual. Nor can we help entertaining the opinion, that recent experience has greatly served to lessen the faith of the most sanguine in their theory of force, and caused them to review proposals they once spurned as visionary and contemptible. While we never doubted the constitutional right of Englishmen to possess arms, we have doubted the propriety of placing reliance on such means for effecting our freedom; and further reflection has convinced us that far more effective and certain means are within our reach. And, again, a few individuals may certainly be found in different parts of the country, whose feelings and sympathies have at times got the better of their judgments, and prompted them to talk violently, or behave unjustly; and others, from very different motives, may have committed very illegal and wicked acts ; but we hold it to be equally as unjust to condemn the great body of Chartists for such acts, as it would be to condemn the whole of the aristocracy, or any class of persons, because bad men have frequently been found among them. But such conduct would appear to be a part of the tactics of our opponents, in order to afford a pretext for prosecution, and to scare the timid and unreflecting from our ranks. It has

been customary, time immemorial, for the advocates of injustice and gainers by corruption, to impugn the motives and execrate the name of every man who, sympathizing with his brethren, has been induced to step out of their ranks to make known their grievances, and embody their feelings in the language of truth.'

We may compare this with the recent testimony from the highest quarter. Since the above sentences were written the sufferings of the people have increased to a degree absolutely unprecedented; while, through the zealous dissemination of political knowledge, the fact has been universally apprehended, that these distresses are the direct result of class legislation and aristocratic institutions. Yet amidst their dreadful privations, aggravated by the consciousness of the black injustice out of which they spring, her Majesty is instructed by her ministers—the sworn foes of popular rights—gratuitously to eulogize, in the late royal speech, the 'patience and fortitude' of the victims. We fully concur in the praise awarded to their patience, though we can imagine that second thoughts might have suggested to ministers some reasons why, at the present crisis, it was undesirable to compliment them on their *fortitude*.

From this consideration of the two cardinal arguments against the doctrine of complete suffrage, we may, we think, safely conclude that the effect of conferring complete suffrage could not be the anarchy, the confiscation, the violation of existing interests, and the equalization of property, which a certain party find their interest in prognosticating, and which a certain other class are weak enough to believe. Moreover, it is but the indication of ignorance, to hold over us, *in terrorem*, the disasters which befel ancient republics, the horrors of the French Revolution, or the popular and foolish calumnies against the working of the democratic principle in America. To the first we reply, that in the classic nations of antiquity, to which young gentlemen fresh from college are fond of referring, *the representative system was unknown*—a consideration which at once destroys all analogy between them and us, and makes any further discussion a mere waste of time. To the second we reply, first, that we have a *middle class* in this country, whose interests blend with those of the masses, and who constitute the ballast of the vessel, while they exercise no less influence in the direction of its course than in the regulation of its motion. This France certainly had not, at the crisis which has afforded so many arguments to all schools of modern politicians, at the close of the eighteenth century. And, secondly, as barring the analogy sought to be established either between the position of this nation and that of the classic and more modern republics, or between Great Britain and France at the period of the Revolution, that we enjoy in our midst the benign, remedial influence of true religion,

whose fruits, indeed, may not nourish the higher moral excellences of the majority, but whose very leaves, by a profound and divine law, 'are for the healing of the nations.' To the argument which respects the great modern republic in the New World, we reply, that, with all the evils which the iniquitous laws of Great Britain inflicted upon her adult and independent children, and in spite of the errors which are perhaps necessary to the childhood of the first century of their independence, they indicate a masculine strength of constitution, and a consequent healthiness of function, which the parent country may well envy. Their young democracy may, indeed, be rampant; the massive masonry of their political structure may need the consolidating influence of time; and they may suffer, too, under the infernal system of slavery conveyed to them by the mother country before her political decease; but they still enjoy the blessing of civil and religious liberty; and they boast a freedom from a crushing debt, to drain away their resources, from aristocratic institutions, to paralyze their political energies, and from a plethoric establishment, to overlay and suffocate their religion.

Taking, then, these various arguments in the aggregate, we conclude that it never has been shewn that the unrepresented multitudes of this country are either intellectually or morally disqualified for the exercise of the electoral right. Upon these grounds, at all events, we feel justified in protesting, in the strongest terms, against the wild and extravagant notion, that their introduction to political power would lead to the invasion of private property and the contempt of law. If in this conviction we are not too sanguine, which we firmly believe that not one thoughtful man in a thousand will deny; if the exercise of their legislative functions would have respect solely to such questions as have engaged the attention of the national assembly for many years past, then we venture to propose one final argument in their favour. Upon the supposed concessions, we venture to contend that it is inconsistent and absurd, as well as unjust, to withhold from them the electoral franchise,—and for this reason; that they cannot possibly use it in such a manner as to shew themselves unfit for its exercise.

For what is the franchise? It is the liberty of recording an opinion on the principal subjects affecting national welfare, such as those we have already instanced, by means of representatives—that is, of voting for A. or B., according as he votes Aye or No on these subjects. In the exercise of the franchise, then, from the nature of the case there can be but two alternatives: there can be no middle way; there can be no third, or ulterior course. The only manner in which the franchise can possibly be exercised, may be summed up in the alternative, Aye or No.

In which of these cases can the constituent indicate his unfitness for his privilege? If, in the one case, he shews his incompetency in company with such men as Dr. Johnson, Pitt, Canning, Eldon, Wellington, and Peel; if, in the other case, he would evince his incompetency by concurring with such men as Fox, Erskine, Brougham, Grey, and Durham; of the two courses which alone an elector *can* take, in the one he would act in concert with one half of the learning, intelligence, and wealth of Great Britain; in the other he would co-operate with the other half. To say nothing, therefore, of the duty of obeying laws being correlative with the power of making them, the *inconsistency* of our opponents seems plain enough. If you withhold the franchise from any members of society, from the fear of their voting *Aye*, then disfranchise all that half of the political community who vote *Aye*. This is but common fairness, if the intelligence of the party is held to be the test of eligibility. If, on the other hand, their voting *No* (the only alternative, be it remembered,) is the proof of their incapacity for the right exercise of their privilege, then disfranchise those who vote *No*. It is futile, and more than futile, to urge that these ignorant constituents would at best only stumble on the truth or error in the dark. How far this may be true of their political superiors, it is impossible to say. But this is beside the question, in both cases. If every individual must act, in the exercise of his franchise, in concert with vast masses of intelligence and practical political knowledge, it is absurd, nay, it is monstrous, to attribute competency on the one hand, or incompetency on the other, to the aristocratic section of either party, and to deny it to the multitude of their humbler supporters. Nor does this train of reasoning receive slight confirmation from the grounds taken by the two antagonist parties, whom we are here opposing in common; for while the bigoted Tory is denouncing this extension of popular rights, under the feigned horror of revolution and anarchy, the aristocratic Whigs are pretending equal fear, lest this concession, the justice of which they seldom attempt to deny, should swell the ranks of the Tories. The reply to both may safely be left to the common sense of the reader, who will probably be reminded of an old proverb, that when knaves quarrel honest men get their own.

In addition to this, it may be desirable to notice, in passing, one other argument propounded by the opponents of popular rights, namely, that if the majority of the constituency was founded in the lower order of society, men of scanty education, of limited knowledge, and of vulgar predilections, would be returned as representatives in parliament. Against this we waive all theoretical objections; we are happy to be enabled to appeal to fact and experience. Private economical societies have long

existed among the operative and unrepresented orders of society, and the excellent results which have notoriously flowed from these institutions have depended upon the practical wisdom displayed in their management. It is matter of universal knowledge, among those who have interested themselves in the working of these societies, that the most suitable persons have been selected to arrange their constitution, and to manage their details, and the benefits which have flowed from their operations have abundantly proved the excellence of their administration.

But if we wish for a more comprehensive illustration of the opinion we are advocating, we may find it in the working of the Municipal Reform Act. By this measure the right of legislating for their local interests has been conferred upon every rate-payer. This has been stigmatized as an anarchical measure, and as calculated to produce 'normal schools of political agitation.' We need hardly say that its effects have falsified all these predictions. It is notorious that, throughout the municipal constituencies of Great Britain, the ablest men have been selected by every party as their local representatives.

We have thus detailed the leading feature of the National Charter, namely, the system of complete suffrage. We confess that we find in it much of political justice, and but little ground for serious and reasonable alarm. We are inclined to believe that the fears which have been entertained, so far as they have existed among honest and reflective men, have generally originated from the partiality of that knowledge which it is the design of these pages to supply. Such, however, is the essence of the Charter. Its other provisions are of a more conventional kind; and on these we shall not at present enter at large. The protection of the vote by means of the ballot we have already considered, and warmly and honestly recommended, and perhaps it is unnecessary in this place to recapitulate our line of argument. The proposal of electoral districts, which forms another feature in the National Charter, appears to us essential to the carrying out of the principle of the representative system. That system has respect obviously to men, and not to localities; and on this principle, and making all allowance for the due influence of property, the existing system is surely indefensible—a system upon which an obscure country town, with few political, and no commercial interests, commands in the legislature an equal number of voices, and an equal degree of influence, with cities which, from their commercial importance, might each be the metropolis of a mighty empire.

We may safely leave, as open questions, the remaining proposals of the Charter, namely, the shortness of the duration of parliaments, and the payment of their members. With respect to the

first, the duration of our parliaments, during the last twenty years, is reduced by an average within very narrow limits. From this certainly no mischievous consequence has arisen; nor, probably, need we apprehend any such results from a further contraction of that duration, under a wise and a well-considered system of popular election. With respect to the second, the working of the present system of an unpaid magistracy at least justifies, if it does not call for, the discussion of both questions.

Upon these subjects, we say, we have not left ourselves room to enter. We have sought to present to the public the claims of the unrepresented classes to complete suffrage, and to exhibit the National Charter stripped of those fallacies which have hitherto made it a bugbear to a large and respectable section of society. A crisis has arrived, at which the principle which we have attempted to develop must meet with the earnest attention of every class of the community. A prevailing sense of dissatisfaction among the neglected class of society; closed markets abroad, and consequent want of employment at home; no profit for the capitalist, and no occupation for the labourer;—these facts, more agitating than all the oratory of demagogues, and all the schemes of statesmen, must now compel us all to an examination of the fundamental principles of our political and commercial institutions; happy if, impressed by the thickening difficulties of the present times, by the sad experience of ages, and by the solemn warnings of religion, we devote ourselves submissively to those great principles of truth and justice which, should we fall in the strife of circumstance, will consecrate our memory as a nation, and which, should we survive the shock under which we are now shaking to our foundation, must establish our national greatness on an immoveable basis;—blessing all orders of mankind, and securing to every one his rights; ‘to the laborious the reward of their industry, to nobles the preservation of their honours, and to princes the stability of their thrones.’

---

Art. VI. *Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay.* Author of ‘Evelina,’ &c. Edited by her Niece. Vols. I. and II. London: Henry Colburn.

FEW of our readers, probably, have much acquaintance with the writings of Madame D'Arblay, whose temporary popularity, although not wholly unmerited, was greatly dependent on time and circumstance. She was the daughter of Dr. Burney, and was born at Lynn Regis, whither her father had retired from London, on account of ill health, the latter half of the last century. The most remarkable features of her childhood were extreme shyness,

and great backwardness in learning. To such an extent was she characterized by the latter quality, that her niece informs us she did not even know her letters when eight years of age. The name familiarly given to her was 'the little dunce,' although her mother, at once more discerning and more indulgent, was accustomed to remark that 'she had no fear about Fanny.' Beneath this unpromising appearance, however, there were qualities which a shrewd observer might easily recognise, as affording promise of future excellence, if not of high superiority. Her powers of imitation were considerable, and the nicety and shrewdness of her observations bespoke an acute and distinguishing mind. 'In company, or before strangers, she was silent, backward, and timid, even to sheepishness; and, from her shyness, had such profound gravity and composure of features, that those of Dr. Burney's friends who went often to his house, and entered into the different humours of the children, never called Fanny by any other name, from the time she had reached her eleventh year, than 'the old lady.' The development of her mental powers, though late, was rapid. By the time she was fourteen, her reading was extensive and varied, and her information consequently was much more enlarged than is common to her age. Her father had by this time returned to London, where his house was the resort of many of the literary men of the day, whose conversations, doubtless, contributed largely to the formation of the young novelist's mind. She soon became distinguished by her habits of seclusion, from which the discerning intellect of her mother-in-law (for Dr. Burney had now married a second time) correctly augured the nature of her occupations. Alarmed for her daughter's welfare, Mrs. Burney strongly urged upon her 'the evil of a scribbling turn in young ladies;' and her expostulations had such effect, that the young authoress resolved to destroy all her manuscripts, and to throw away her pen. The former part of her resolution was faithfully executed, but the latter, though nobly attempted, was speedily repented of.

Amongst the works destroyed at this time, when Frances, it must be remembered, was only in her fifteenth year, was a tale of considerable length, which contained, probably, the germ of her subsequent 'Evelina.' The *cacoethes scribendi* was, however, too powerful to be long suppressed; and Miss Burney, in consequence, unknown to any of her friends, occupied herself in the preparation of a work which was to determine the complexion of her future history. The secret was communicated to her sisters; and a younger brother, whose services it was necessary to engage, was ultimately taken into her confidence. Mr. Dodsley, to whom her manuscript was first offered, declined to look at anything anonymous; and Mr. Lowndes, to whom it was sub-

sequently tendered, returned an offer of twenty pounds for the copyright; 'an offer,' we are informed, 'which was accepted with alacrity, and boundless surprise at its magnificence.' 'Evelina' was published in January, 1778, and suddenly attained a degree of popularity which fell to the lot of but few contemporaneous works. Of the literary merits of 'Evelina,' and its successors, 'Cecilia,' 'Camilla,' and the 'Wanderer,' it is not our purpose at present to speak. There is a great deal of mannerism throughout them, but their merits, especially those of the first, must have been of no mean order, to unite the suffrage of such men as Dr. Johnson, Mr. Burke, Sir Joshua Reynolds, and Mr. Sheridan. Mrs. Inchbald's criticism on 'Evelina' is substantially applicable to each of Madame D'Arblay's novels. The following extract from it will sufficiently describe their character:—'The heroine is a young lady, amiable and unexperienced, who is continually getting into difficulties from not knowing, or not observing, the established etiquette of society, and from being unluckily connected with a number of vulgar characters, by whom she is involved in adventures both ludicrous and mortifying. The hero is a generous and pleasing lover. The other characters of the piece are, a lady wit and oddity, a gay, insolent baronet, a group of vulgar cits, and a number of young bucks, whose coldness, carelessness, rudeness, and impertinent gallantry, serve as a foil to the delicate attentions of the hero.'

The work now before us commences with the publication of 'Evelina,' whose reception by the literary world is noted with all the minuteness and fond interest of a young author. The manuscripts from which it is printed are represented as having been arranged with the most scrupulous care by Madame D'Arblay, in her later years, who affixed to them such explanations as she deemed requisite, and finally consigned them to her niece, 'with full permission to publish whatever might be judged desirable for that purpose; and with no negative injunctions except ONE, which has been scrupulously obeyed, that, whatever might be effaced or omitted, **NOTHING** should in anywise be altered or added to her records.' The great interest of the diary and correspondence consists in the light which they throw on the fashionable and literary circles of the day, and more especially in the opportunities they furnish of renewing intercourse with some old friends, by whose wit, learning, and wisdom, we have frequently been charmed and benefited. A large portion of the diary might have been omitted, without detriment to the work; but we are quite willing to pay the penalty imposed, in order to secure the more sterling and valuable portions of the record. It is impossible to listen to the conversation of such men as Burke, Johnson, Reynolds, Sheridan, and Goldsmith, or of

such lady wits as Mrs. Montagu, Mrs. Thrale, and Mrs. Cholmondeley, without being charmed with the brilliancy of their imaginations, or improved by the depth of their philosophy. But our readers will want to know what is the character of the contents of these volumes, and we proceed, therefore, to furnish them with a few extracts, from which they may form a pretty accurate notion for themselves. The publication of 'Evelina' introduced Miss Burney to the Thrale family, at Streatham, where she engaged much of Dr. Johnson's notice, and far more of his affection than fell to the lot of most. The following describes her first visit to Mrs. Thrale's, which occurred in August, 1778 :—

' Mr. Thrale's house is white, and very pleasantly situated, in a fine paddock. Mrs. Thrale was strolling about, and came to us as we got out of the chaise.

' ' Ah,' cried she, ' I hear Dr. Burney's voice! and you have brought your daughter?—well, now you are good!'

' She then received me, taking both my hands, and with mixed politeness and cordiality welcoming me to Streatham. She led me into the house, and addressed herself almost wholly for a few minutes to my father, as if to give me an assurance she did not mean to regard me as a show, or to distress or frighten me by drawing me out. Afterwards she took me up stairs, and shewed me the house, and said she had very much wished to see me at Streatham, and should always think herself much obliged to Dr. Burney for his goodness in bringing me, which she looked upon as a very great favour.

' But though we were some time together, and though she was so very civil, she did not *hint* at my book, and I love her much more than ever for her delicacy in avoiding a subject which she could not but see would have greatly embarrassed me.

' When we returned to the music-room, we found Miss Thrale was with my father. Miss Thrale is a very fine girl, about fourteen years of age, but cold and reserved, though full of knowledge and intelligence.

' Soon after, Mrs. Thrale took me to the library; she talked a little while upon common topics, and then, at last, she mentioned 'Evelina.'

' ' Yesterday, at supper,' said she, ' we talked it all over, and discussed all your characters; but Dr. Johnson's favourite is Mr. Smith. He declares the fine gentleman *manqué* was never better drawn: and he acted him all the evening, saying he was 'all for the ladies!' He repeated whole scenes by heart. I declare I was astonished at him. O you can't imagine how much he is pleased with the book; he 'could not get rid of the rogue,' he told me. But was it not droll,' said she, ' that I should recommend it to Dr. Burney? and tease him so innocently, to read it?'

' We were summoned to dinner. Mrs. Thrale made my father and me sit on each side of her. I said that I hoped I did not take Dr. Johnson's place;—for he had not yet appeared.

"No," answered Mrs. Thrale, "he will sit by you, which I am sure will give him great pleasure."

"Soon after we were seated this great man entered. I have so true a veneration for him, that the very sight of him inspires me with delight and reverence, notwithstanding the cruel infirmities to which he is subject; for he has almost perpetual convulsive movements, either of his hands, lips, feet, or knees, and sometimes of all together."

Mrs. Thrale introduced me to him, and he took his place. We had a noble dinner, and a most elegant dessert. Dr. Johnson, in the middle of dinner, asked Mrs. Thrale what was in some little pies that were near him.

"Mutton," answered she, "so I don't ask you to eat any, because I know you despise it."

"No, madam, no," cried he; "I despise nothing that is good of its sort; but I am too proud now to eat of it. Sitting by Miss Burney makes me very proud to-day!"

"Miss Burney," said Mrs. Thrale, laughing, "you must take great care of your heart if Dr. Johnson attacks it; for I assure you he is not often successless."

"What's that you say, madam?" cried he; "are you making mischief between the young lady and me already?"

A little while after he drank Miss Thrale's health and mine, and then added,

"'Tis a terrible thing that we cannot wish young ladies well, without wishing them to become old women!"

"But some people," said Mr. Seward, "are old and young at the same time, for they wear so well that they never look old."

"No, sir, no," cried the Doctor, laughing; "that never yet was; you might as well say they are at the same time tall and short. I remember an epitaph to that purpose, which is in ——"

"(I have quite forgot what,—and also the name it was made upon, but the rest I recollect exactly :)

"——— lies buried here;  
So early wise, so lasting fair,  
That none, unless her years you told,  
Thought her a child, or thought her old."

Mrs. Thrale then repeated some lines in French, and Dr. Johnson some more in Latin. An epilogue of Mr. Garrick's to *Bonduca* was then mentioned, and Dr. Johnson said it was a miserable performance, and everybody agreed it was the worst he had ever made.

"And yet," said Mr. Seward, "it has been very much admired; but it is in praise of English valour, and so I suppose the subject made it popular."

"I don't know: sir," said Dr. Johnson, "anything about the subject, for I could not read on till I came to it; I got through half a dozen lines, but I could observe no other subject than eternal dulness. I don't know what is the matter with David; I am afraid he is grown superannuated, for his prologues and epilogues used to be incomparable."

“Nothing is so fatiguing,” said Mrs. Thrale, “as the life of a wit: he and Wilks are the two oldest men of their ages I know, for they have both worn themselves out, by being eternally on the rack to give entertainment to others.”

“David, madam,” said the Doctor, “looks much older than he is; for his face has had double the business of any other man’s; it is never at rest; when he speaks one minute, he has quite a different countenance to what he assumes the next; I don’t believe he ever kept the same look for half an hour together in the whole course of his life; and such an eternal, restless, fatiguing play of the muscles, must certainly wear out a man’s face before its real time.”

“O yes,” cried Mrs. Thrale, “we must certainly make some allowance for such tear and wear of a man’s face.”—Vol. I. pp. 36—40.

Our next quotation describes a scene which took place at Mr. Lowndes, the publisher’s, whither Miss Burney and her mother had gone *incog.*, to make some inquiries respecting *Evelina*.

“We introduced ourselves by buying the book, for which I had a commission from Mrs. G——. Fortunately, Mr. Lowndes himself was in the shop; as we found by his air of consequence and authority, as well as his age; for I never saw him before.

“The moment he had given my mother the book, she asked if he could tell her who wrote it.

“No,” he answered; “I don’t know myself.”

“Pho, pho,” said she, “you mayn’t choose to tell, but you must know.”

“I don’t, indeed, ma’am,” answered he; “I have no honour in keeping the secret, for I have never been trusted. All I know of the matter is, that it is a gentleman of the other end of the town.”

“My mother made a thousand other inquiries, to which his answers were to the following effect: that for a great while he did not know if it was a man or a woman; but now, he knew that much, and that he was a master of his subject, and well versed in the manners of the times.

“For some time,” continued he, “I thought it had been Horace Walpole’s; for he once published a book in his snug manner; but I don’t think it is now. I have often people come to inquire of me who it is; but I suppose he will come out soon, and then, when the rest of the world knows it, I shall. Servants often come for it from the other end of the town, and I have asked them divers questions myself, to see if I could get at the author; but I never got any satisfaction.”

“Just before we came away, upon my mother’s still further pressing him, he said, with a most important face,

“Why, to tell you the truth, madam, I have been informed that it is a piece of real secret history; and, in that case, it will never be known.”

“This was too much for me; I grinned irresistibly, and was obliged to look out at the shop-door till we came away.

“How many ridiculous things have I heard upon this subject! I

hope that next, some particular family will be fixed upon, to whom this secret history must belong. However, I am delighted to find myself so safe.'—Ib. pp. 43, 44.

The following notices of Dr. Johnson are a sample of those spread throughout the Diary, and will form a not unwelcome supplement to 'Boswell.'

'Dr. Johnson, as usual, came last into the library; he was in high spirits, and full of mirth and sport. I had the honour of sitting next to him: and now, all at once, he flung aside his reserve, thinking, perhaps, that it was time I should fling aside mine.'

'Mrs. Thrale told him that she intended taking me to Mr. T—'s.

'So you ought, madam,' cried he, 'tis your business to be Cicerone to her.'

'Then suddenly he snatched my hand, and kissing it,

'Ah!' he added, 'they will little think what a tartar you carry to them.'

'No, that they wont!' cried Mrs. Thrale; 'Miss Burney looks so meek and so quiet, nobody would suspect what a comical girl she is; but I believe she has a great deal of malice at heart.'

'Oh, she's a toad!' cried the doctor, laughing—'a sly young rogue! with her Smiths and her Branghtons!'

'Why, Dr. Johnson,' said Mrs. Thrale, 'I hope you are very well this morning! if one may judge by your spirits and good humour, the fever you threatened us with is gone off.'

'He had complained that he was going to be ill last night.'

'Why no, madam, no,' answered he, 'I am not yet well; I could not sleep at all; there I lay, restless and uneasy, and thinking all the time of Miss Burney. Perhaps I have offended her, thought I; perhaps she is angry; I have seen her but once, and I talked to her of a rasher!—Were you angry?'

'I think I need not tell you my answer.'

'I have been endeavouring to find some excuse,' continued he, 'and, as I could not sleep, I got up, and looked for some authority for the word; and I find, madam, it is used by Dryden: in one of his prologues, he says—'And snatch a homely rasher from the coals.' So you must not mind me, madam; I say strange things, but I mean no harm.'

'I was almost afraid he thought I was really idiot enough to have taken him seriously; but, a few minutes after, he put his hand on my arm, and shaking his head, exclaimed,

'Oh, you are a sly little rogue!—what a Holbourn beau have you drawn!'

'Ay, Miss Burney,' said Mrs. Thrale, 'the Holbourn beau is Dr. Johnson's favourite; and we have all your characters by heart, from Mr. Smith up to Lady Louisa.'

'Oh, Mr. Smith, Mr. Smith is the man!' cried he, laughing violently. 'Harry Fielding never drew so good a character!—such a fine varnish of low politeness!—such a struggle to appear a gentleman!'

Madam, there is no character better drawn anywhere—in any book or by any author.'—Ib. 53, 54.

'While we were yet reading this 'Rambler,' Dr. Johnson came in; we told him what we were about.

'Ah, madam!' cried he, 'Goldsmith was not scrupulous; but he would have been a great man had he known the real value of his own internal resources.'

'Miss Burney,' said Mrs. Thrale, 'is fond of his 'Vicar of Wakefield:' and so am I;—don't you like it, sir?'

'No, madam, it is very faulty; there is nothing of real life in it, and very little of nature. It is a mere fanciful performance.'

He then seated himself upon a sofa, and calling to me, said, 'Come,—Evelina,—come and sit by me.'

I obeyed; and he took me almost in his arms,—that is, one of his arms, for one would go three times, at least, round me,—and, half laughing, half serious, he charged me to 'be a good girl!'

'But, my dear,' continued he with a very droll look, 'what makes you so fond of the Scotch? I don't like you for that;—I hate these Scotch, and so must you. I wish Branghton had sent the dog to jail! That Scotch dog Macartney.'

'Why, sir,' said Mrs. Thrale, 'don't you remember he says he would, but that he should get nothing by it?'

'Why, ay, true,' cried the doctor, see-sawing very solemnly, 'that indeed, is some palliation for his forbearance. But I must not have you so fond of the Scotch, my little Burney; make your hero what you will but a Scotchman. Besides, you write Scotch—you say 'the one,'—my dear, that's not English. Never use that phrase again.'

'Perhaps,' said Mrs. Thrale, 'it may be used in Macartney's letter, and then it will be a propriety.'

'No, madam, no!' cried he; 'you can't make a beauty of it; it is in the third volume; put it in Macartney's letter, and welcome!—that, or anything that is nonsense.'

'Why, surely,' cried I, 'the poor man is used ill enough by the Branghtons.'

'But Branghton,' said he, 'only hates him because of his wretchedness,—poor fellow!—But, my dear love, how should he ever have eaten a good dinner before he came to England?'

And then he laughed violently at young Branghton's idea.

'Well,' said Mrs. Thrale, 'I always liked Macartney; he is a very pretty character, and I took to him, as the folks say.'

'Why, madam,' answered he, 'I like Macartney myself. Yes, poor fellow, I liked the man, but I love not the nation.'

And then he proceeded, in a dry manner, to make at once sarcastic reflections on the Scotch, and flattering speeches to me, for Macartney's firing at the national insults of young Branghton: his stubborn resolution in not owning, even to his bosom friend, his wretchedness of poverty; and his fighting at last for the honour of his nation, when he resisted all other provocations; he said, were all extremely well marked.—Ib. 59, 60.

'A little while after he asked Mrs. Thrale, who had read 'Evelina' in his absence?

"Who?" cried she;—"why Burke!—Burke sat up all night to finish it; and Sir Joshua Reynolds is mad about it, and said he would give fifty pounds to know the author. But our fun was with his nieces—we made them believe I wrote the book, and the girls gave me the credit of it at once.'

"I am sorry for it, madam," cried he, quite angrily,—"you were much to blame; deceits of that kind ought never to be practised; they have a worse tendency than you are aware of."

'Mrs. T.—"Why, don't frighten yourself, sir; Miss Burney will have all the credit she has a right to, for I told them whose it was before they went.'

'Dr. J.—"But you were very wrong for misleading them a moment; such jests are extremely blameable; they are foolish in the very act, and they are wrong, because they always leave a doubt upon the mind. What first passed will be always recollected by those girls, and they will never feel clearly convinced which wrote the book, Mrs. Thrale or Miss Burney.'

'Mrs. T.—"Well, well, I am ready to take my Bible oath it was not me; and if that won't do, Miss Burney must take hers too.'

'I was then looking over the 'Life of Cowley,' which he had himself given me to read, at the same time that he gave to Mrs. Thrale that of Waller. They are now printed, though they will not be published for some time. But he bade me put it away.'

"Do," cried he, "put away that now, and prattle with us; I can't make this little Burney prattle, and I am sure she prattles well; but I shall teach her another lesson than to sit thus silent before I have done with her.'

"To talk," cried I, "is the only lesson I shall be backward to learn from you, sir."

"You shall give me," cried he, "a discourse upon the passions: come, begin! Tell us the necessity of regulating them, watching over and curbing them! Did you ever read Norris's 'Theory of Love.'"

"No, sir," said I, laughing, yet staring a little.

'Dr. J.—"Well, it is worth your reading. He will make you see that inordinate love is the root of all evil: inordinate love of wealth brings on avarice; of wine, brings on intemperance; of power, brings on cruelty; and so on. He deduces from inordinate love all human frailty.'

'Mrs. T.—"To-morrow, sir, Mrs. Montagu dines here, and then you will have talk enough."

'Dr. Johnson began to see-saw, with a countenance strongly expressive of inward fun, and after enjoying it some time in silence, he suddenly, and with great animation, turned to me and cried,

"Down with her, Burney!—down with her!—spare her not!—attack her, fight her, and down with her at once! You are a rising wit, and she is at the top; and when I was beginning the world, and was nothing and nobody, the joy of my life was to fire at all the

established wits! and then everybody loved to halloo me on. But there is no game now; everybody would be glad to see me conquered: but then, when I was new, to vanquish the great ones was all the delight of my poor little dear soul! So at her, Burney—at her, and down with her!—Ib. 95, 96.

The following account of a political discussion between Dr. Johnson and Sir Philip Jennings Clerke, is too characteristic of the former to be omitted. It is addressed by Miss Burney to her sister Susan.

‘ Men of such different principles as Dr. Johnson and Sir Philip, you may imagine, cannot have much sympathy or cordiality in their political debates; however, the very superior abilities of the former, and the remarkable good breeding of the latter, have kept both upon good terms; though they have had several arguments, in which each has exerted his utmost force for conquest.

‘ The heads of one of their debates I must try to remember, because I should be sorry to forget. Sir Philip explained his bill; Dr. Johnson at first scoffed it; Mr. Thrale betted a guinea the motion would not pass, and Sir Philip, that he should divide a hundred and fifty upon it.

‘ I am afraid, my dear Susan, you already tremble at this political commencement, but I will soon have done, for I know your taste too well to enlarge upon this theme.

‘ Sir Philip, addressing himself to Mrs. Thrale, hoped she would not suffer the Tories to warp her judgment, and told me he hoped my father had not tainted my principles; and then he further explained his bill, and indeed made it appear so equitable, that Mrs. Thrale gave in to it, and wished her husband to vote for it. He still hung back; but, to our general surprise, Dr. Johnson having made more particular inquiries into its merits, first softened towards it, and then declared it a very rational and fair bill, and joined with Mrs. Thrale in soliciting Mr. Thrale’s vote.

‘ Sir Philip was, and with very good reason, quite delighted. He opened upon politics more amply, and freely declared his opinions, which were so strongly against the government, and so much bordering upon the republican principles, that Dr. Johnson suddenly took fire; he called back his recantation, begged Mr. Thrale not to vote for Sir Philip’s bill, and grew very animated against his antagonist.

‘ ‘ The bill,’ said he, ‘ ought to be opposed by all honest men! in itself, and considered simply, it is equitable, and I would forward it; but when we find what a faction it is to support and encourage, it ought not to be listened to. All men should oppose it who do not wish well to sedition!’

‘ These and several other expressions yet more strong, he made use of; and had Sir Philip had less unalterable politeness, I believe they would have had a vehement quarrel. He maintained his ground, however, with calmness and steadiness, though he had neither argument nor wit at all equal to such an opponent.

‘Dr. Johnson pursued him with unabating vigour and dexterity, and at length, though he could not convince, he so entirely baffled him, that Sir Philip was self-compelled to be quiet—which, with a very good grace, he confessed.

‘Dr. Johnson then, recollecting himself, and thinking, as he owned afterwards, that the dispute grew too serious, with a skill all his own, suddenly and unexpectedly turned it to burlesque; and taking Sir Philip by the hand at the moment we arose after supper, and were separating for the night,

‘Sir Philip,’ said he, ‘you are too liberal a man for the party to which you belong; I shall have much pride in the honour of converting you; for I really believe, if you were not spoiled by bad company, the spirit of faction would not have possessed you. Go, then, sir, to the House, but make not your motion! Give up your bill, and surprise the world by turning to the side of truth and reason. Rise, sir, when they least expect you, and address your fellow-patriots to this purpose:—Gentlemen, I have, for many a weary day, been deceived and seduced by you. I have now opened my eyes; I see that you are all scoundrels—the subversion of all government is your aim. Gentlemen, I will no longer herd among rascals in whose infamy my name and character must be included. I therefore renounce you all, gentlemen, as you deserve to be renounced.’

‘Then, shaking his head heartily, he added,

‘Go, sir, go to bed; meditate upon this recantation, and rise in the morning a more honest man than you laid down.’—Ib. pp. 180—183.

The diary furnishes ample evidence of the jocularity and light-heartedness in which Dr. Johnson could occasionally indulge, as well as of the liveliness and kind feeling by which Mrs. Thrale was distinguished. Amongst other references to the former, the following will perhaps astonish some of our readers, whose opinion of the lexicographer is grounded on a one-sided view of his character:—‘Dr. Johnson has more fun, and comical humour, and love of nonsense about him, than almost anybody I ever saw; I mean, when with those he likes; for otherwise, he can be as severe and as bitter as report relates him.’ Mrs. Thrale had to endure much from his overbearing temper, the roughness and violence of which increased with his advancing years. Others were not equally submissive. They resented Johnson’s violence, and in many cases effected his exclusion from circles in which he was desirous of moving. The following, which occurred at Streatham, is an instance of this kind:—

‘We had a terrible noisy day. Mr. and Mrs. Cator came to dinner, and brought with them Miss Collison, a niece. Mrs. Nesbitt was also here, and Mr. Pepys.

‘The long war which has been proclaimed among the wits concerning Lord Lyttelton’s ‘Life,’ by Dr. Johnson, and which a whole tribe of *blues*, with Mrs. Montagu at their head, have vowed to execrate and

revenge, now broke out with all the fury of the first actual hostilities, stimulated by long-concerted schemes and much spiteful information. Mr. Pepys, Dr. Johnson well knew, was one of Mrs. Montagu's steadiest abettors, and, therefore, as he had some time determined to defend himself with the first of them he met, this day he fell the sacrifice to his wrath.

'In a long *tête-à-tête* which I accidentally had with Mr. Pepys before the company was assembled, he told me his apprehensions of an attack, and entreated me earnestly to endeavour to prevent it; modestly avowing he was no antagonist for Dr. Johnson, and yet declaring his personal friendship for Lord Lyttelton made him so much hurt by the 'Life,' that he feared he could not discuss the matter without a quarrel, which, especially in the house of Mrs. Thrale, he wished to avoid.

'It was, however, utterly impossible for me to serve him. I could have stopped Mrs. Thrale with ease, and Mr. Seward with a hint, had either of them begun the subject; but, unfortunately, in the middle of dinner, it was begun by Dr. Johnson himself, to oppose whom, especially as he spoke with great anger, would have been madness and folly.

'Never before have I seen Dr. Johnson speak with so much passion.

'"Mr. Pepys," he cried, in a voice the most enraged, "I understand you are offended by my 'Life of Lord Lyttelton.' What is it you have to say against it? Come forth, man! Here am I, ready to answer any charge you can bring!"

'"No, sir," cried Mr. Pepys, "not at present; I must beg leave to decline the subject. I told Miss Burney before dinner that I hoped it would not be started."

'I was quite frightened to hear my own name mentioned in a debate which began so seriously; but Dr. Johnson made not to this any answer: he repeated his attack and his challenge, and a violent disputation ensued, in which this great but *mortal* man did, to own the truth, appear unreasonably furious and grossly severe. I never saw him so before, and I heartily hope I never shall again. He has been long provoked, and justly enough, at the *sneaking* complaints and murmurs of the Lytteltonians; and, therefore, his long-excited wrath, which hitherto had met no object, now burst forth with a vehemence and bitterness almost incredible.

'Mr. Pepys meantime never appeared to so much advantage; he preserved his temper, uttered all that belonged merely to himself with modesty, and all that more immediately related to Lord Lyttelton with spirit. Indeed, Dr. Johnson, in the very midst of the dispute, had the candour and liberality to make him a personal compliment, by saying,—

'"Sir, all that you say, while you are vindicating one who cannot thank you, makes me only think better of you than I ever did before. Yet still I think you do *me* wrong," &c. &c.

'Some time after, in the heat of the argument, he called out—

'"The more my 'Lord Lyttelton' is inquired after, the worse he will appear; Mr. Seward has just heard two stories of him, which corroborate all I have related."

'He then desired Mr. Seward to repeat them. Poor Mr. Seward

looked almost as frightened as myself at the very mention of his name; but he quietly and immediately told the stories, which consisted of fresh instances, from good authorities, of Lord Lyttelton's illiberal behaviour to Shenstone; and then he flung himself back in his chair, and spoke no more during the whole debate, which I am sure he was ready to vote a bore.

'One happy circumstance, however, attended the quarrel, which was the presence of Mr. Cator, who would by no means be prevented talking himself, either by reverence for Dr. Johnson, or ignorance of the subject in question; on the contrary, he gave his opinion, quite uncalled, upon every thing that was said by either party, and that with an importance and pomposity, yet with an emptiness and verbosity, that rendered the whole dispute, when in his hands, nothing more than ridiculous, and compelled even the disputants themselves, all inflamed as they were, to laugh. To give a specimen—one speech will do for a thousand.

'As to this here question of Lord Lyttelton I can't speak to it to the purpose, as I have not read his 'Life,' for I have only read the 'Life of Pope'; I have got the books though, for I sent for them last week, and they came to me on Wednesday, and then I began them; but I have not yet read 'Lord Lyttelton.' 'Pope' I have begun, and that is what I am now reading. But what I have to say about Lord Lyttelton is this here: Mr. Seward says that Lord Lyttelton's steward dunned Mr. Shenstone for his rent, by which I understand he was a tenant of Lord Lyttelton's. Well, if he was a tenant of Lord Lyttelton's, why should not he pay his rent?

'Who could contradict this?

'When dinner was quite over, and we left the men to their wine, we hoped they would finish the affair; but Dr. Johnson was determined to talk it through, and make a battle of it, though Mr. Pepys tried to be off continually. When they were all summoned to tea, they entered still warm and violent. Mr. Cator had the book in his hand, and was reading the 'Life of Lyttelton,' that he might better, he said, understand the cause, though not a creature cared if he had never heard of it.

'Mr. Pepys came up to me, and said,—

'Just what I had so much wished to avoid! I have been crushed in the very onset.'

'I could make him no answer, for Dr. Johnson immediately called him off, and harangued and attacked him with a vehemence and continuity that quite concerned both Mrs. Thrale and myself, and that made Mr. Pepys, at last, resolutely silent, however called upon.

'This now grew more unpleasant than ever; till Mr. Cator, having some time studied his book, exclaimed,—

'What I am now going to say, as I have not yet read the 'Life of Lord Lyttelton' quite through, must be considered as being only said aside, because what I am going to say—'

'I wish, sir,' cried Mrs. Thrale, 'it had been *all* said aside; here is too much about it, indeed, and I should be very glad to hear no more of it.'

‘ This speech, which she made with great spirit and dignity, had an admirable effect. Everybody was silenced. Mr. Cator, thus interrupted in the midst of his proposition, looked quite amazed; Mr. Pepys was much gratified by the interference; and Dr. Johnson, after a pause, said,—

‘ ‘ Well, madam, you *shall* hear no more of it; yet I will defend myself in every part and in every atom! ’

‘ And from this time the subject was wholly dropped. This dear violent Doctor was conscious he had been wrong, and therefore he most candidly bore the reproof.’—Vol. ii. pp. 45—49.

The great moralist was now, it must be remembered, in his 73rd year, when the mildness and tempered dignity of age ought to have somewhat moderated the asperities of the younger man. But Johnson had, unhappily for himself, been allowed to domineer so long that the evil habit of his mind had become inveterate, and broke out consequently on many occasions into overt acts discreditable to himself and painful to others. Miss Burney alludes in many parts of her Diary to the unhappy consequences of this violence, but our space forbids extract.

Amongst the visitors at Streatham were Mr. Crutchley and Mr. Seward, two gentlemen of fortune, at once proud and misanthropic, yet generous withal. A laughable instance is given of the ingenuity with which they could at least affect to be vastly different from other folks :—

‘ There passed, some time ago, an agreement between Mr. Crutchley and Mr. Seward, that the latter is to make a visit to the former, at his country-house in Berkshire; and to-day the time was settled; but a more ridiculous scene never was exhibited. The host elect and the guest elect tried which should shew least expectation of pleasure from the meeting, and neither of them thought it at all worth while to disguise his terror of being weary of the other. Mr. Seward seemed quite melancholy and depressed in the prospect of making, and Mr. Crutchley absolutely miserable in that of receiving, the visit. Yet nothing so ludicrous as the distress of both, since nothing less necessary than that either should have such a punishment inflicted. I cannot remember half the absurd things that passed; but a few, by way of specimen, I will give.

‘ ‘ How long do you intend to stay with me, Seward?’ cried Mr. Crutchley; ‘ how long do you think you can bear it?’

‘ ‘ O, I don’t know; I sha’n’t fix,’ answered the other: ‘ just as I find it.’

‘ ‘ Well, but,—when shall you come? Friday or Saturday? I think you’d better not come till Saturday.’

‘ ‘ Why, yes, I believe on Friday.’

‘ ‘ On Friday! Oh! you’ll have too much of it! What shall I do with you?’

‘ ‘ Why on Sunday we’ll dine at the Lyells. Mrs. Lyell is a charming woman; one of the most elegant creatures I ever saw.’

"Wonderfully so," cried Mr. Crutchley, "I like her extremely—an insipid idiot! She never opens her mouth but in a whisper; I never *heard* her speak a word in my life. But what must I do with you on Monday? will you come away?"

"Oh, no; I'll stay and see it out."

"Why, how long shall you stay? Why, I must come away myself on Tuesday."

"O, I sha'n't settle yet," cried Mr. Seward, very drily. "I shall put up six shirts, and then do as I find it."

"Six shirts!" exclaimed Mr. Crutchley; and then, with equal dryness added—"Oh, I suppose you wear two a-day?"—Ib., pp. 53, 54.

We pass over the circumstances connected with the publication, in 1782, of Miss Burney's second work, entitled 'Cecilia'; but must not omit a letter from Edmund Burke, under date of the 29th of July. This great statesman is reported to have sat up all night, in order to complete the perusal of her former work. Such a letter as the following, from a man like Edmund Burke, was enough to turn the brain of a much older person than the lady to whom it was addressed:—

"Madam,—I should feel exceedingly to blame if I could refuse to myself the natural satisfaction, and to you the just but poor return, of my best thanks for the very great instruction and entertainment I have received from the new present you have bestowed on the public. There are few—I believe I may say fairly there are none at all—that will not find themselves better informed concerning human nature, and their stock of observation enriched, by reading your 'Cecilia.' They certainly will, let their experience in life and manners be what it may. The arrogance of age must submit to be taught by youth. You have crowded into a few small volumes an incredible variety of characters; most of them well planned, well supported, and well contrasted with each other. If there be any fault in this respect, it is one in which you are in no great danger of being imitated. Justly as your characters are drawn, perhaps they are too numerous. But I beg pardon; I fear it is quite in vain to preach economy to those who are come young to excessive and sudden opulence.

"I might trespass on your delicacy if I should fill my letter to you with what I fill my conversation to others. I should be troublesome to you alone if I should tell you all I feel and think on the natural vein of humour, the tender pathetic, the comprehensive and noble moral, and the sagacious observation, that appear quite throughout that extraordinary performance.

"In an age distinguished by producing extraordinary women, I hardly dare to tell you where my opinion would place you amongst them. I respect your modesty, that will not endure the commendations which your merit forces from everybody.

"I have the honour to be, with great gratitude, respect, and esteem, madam, your most obedient and most humble servant, EDM. BURKE."—Ib., pp. 148, 149.

The mutable character of human friendship was strikingly shewn in the alienations consequent upon Mrs. Thrale's second marriage. It was strongly objected to by all her friends; yet nothing could justify the terms in which some of them ventured to speak of it. Johnson, at least, should have been silent when he could not commend. He had received so much kindness, had been entertained with such enduring and courteous hospitality, that, of all men living, he should have been the last to speak of Mrs. Thrale in other terms than those of affectionate and grateful remembrance. He might have grieved over what he deemed her imprudence, and have privately expostulated with her respecting it; but his heart must have been harsh and cruel to have permitted him, in reply to Miss Burney's inquiry whether he ever heard from Mrs. Thrale, to answer, 'No, nor write to her; I drive her quite from my mind. If I meet with one of her letters, I burn it instantly. I have burnt all I can find. I never speak of her, and I desire never to hear of her more. I drive her, as I have said, wholly from my mind.'

This marriage terminated Miss Burney's intercourse with Mrs. Thrale, to whose kindness she had been largely indebted; and it is due to the former to remark, that her references to the latter are uniformly kind and respectful. 'Thus stopped,' she remarks, 'a correspondence of almost unequalled partiality and fondness on her (Mrs. Thrale's) side, and affection, gratitude, admiration, and sincerity on that of F. B., who could only conjecture the cessation to be caused by the resentment of Piozzi, when informed of her constant opposition to the union.'

The publication of 'Cecilia' led to the introduction of its author to the Queen of George the Third, and ultimately to her appointment as a member of the royal household. Her first interview with the King and Queen occurred at the residence of Mrs. Delany, widow of Dr. Patrick Delany, Dean of Down, and is detailed with a minuteness for which few readers will require an apology. The royal pair appear to have been in the habit of free and unreserved intercourse with Mrs. Delany, who was residing at this time in a house which they had provided for her at Windsor. Both the King and Queen had expressed a desire to see Miss Burney, and the circumstances under which the interview ultimately took place were not adapted to diminish her agitation. They are thus described:—

'After dinner, while Mrs. Delany was left alone, as usual, to take a little rest,—for sleep it but seldom proves,—Mr. B. Dewes, his little daughter, Miss Port, and myself, went into the drawing-room. And here, while, to pass the time, I was amusing the little girl with teaching her some Christmas games, in which her father and cousin joined,

Mrs. Delany came in. We were all in the middle of the room, and in some confusion;—but she had just but come up to us to inquire what was going forwards, and I was disentangling myself from Miss Dewes, to be ready to fly off if any one knocked at the street-door, when the door of the drawing-room was again opened, and a large man in deep mourning appeared at it, entering and shutting it himself without speaking.

‘A ghost could not more have scared me, when I discovered, by its glitter on the black, a star! The general disorder had prevented his being seen, except by myself, who was always on the watch, till Miss P—, turning round, exclaimed, ‘The King!—Aunt, the King!’

‘O mercy! thought I, that I were but out of the room! which way shall I escape? and how pass him unnoticed? There is but the single door at which he entered, in the room! Every one scampered out of the way: Miss P—, to stand next the door; Mr. Bernard Dewes to a corner opposite it; his little girl clung to me; and Mrs. Delany advanced to meet his Majesty, who, after quietly looking on till she saw him, approached, and inquired how she did.

‘He then spoke to Mr. Bernard, whom he had already met two or three times here.

‘I had now retreated to the wall, and purposed gliding softly, though speedily, out of the room; but before I had taken a single step, the King, in a loud whisper to Mrs. Delany, said, ‘Is that Miss Burney?’—and on her answering, ‘Yes, sir,’ he bowed, and with a countenance of the most perfect good humour, came close up to me.

‘A most profound reverence on my part arrested the progress of my intended retreat.

‘‘How long have you been come back, Miss Burney?’

‘‘Two days, sir.’

‘Unluckily he did not hear me, and repeated his question; and whether the second time he heard me or not, I don’t know, but he made a little civil inclination of his head, and went back to Mrs. Delany.

\* \* \* \* \*

‘A good deal of talk then followed about his own health, and the extreme temperance by which he preserved it. The fault of his constitution, he said, was a tendency to excessive fat, which he kept, however, in order, by the most vigorous exercise, and the strictest attention to a simple diet.

‘When Mrs. Delany was beginning to praise his forbearance, he stopped her.

‘‘No, no,’ he cried, ‘tis no virtue; I only prefer eating plain and little, to growing diseased and infirm.’

\* \* \* \* \*

‘When the discourse upon health and strength was over, the King went up to the table, and looked at a book of prints, from Claude Lorraine, which had been brought down for Miss Dewes; but Mrs. Delany, by mistake, told him they were for me. He turned over a leaf or two, and then said—

“ ‘ Pray, does Miss Burney draw, too?’

‘ The *too* was pronounced very civilly.

‘ ‘ I believe not, sir,’ answered Mrs. Delany; ‘ at least, she does not tell?’

‘ ‘ Oh!’ cried he, laughing, ‘ that’s nothing! she is not apt to tell; she never does tell, you know!—Her father told me that himself. He told me the whole history of her Evelina. And I shall never forget his face when he spoke of his feelings at first taking up the book!—he looked quite frightened, just as if he was doing it that moment! I never can forget his face while I live!’

‘ Then coming up close to me, he said—

‘ ‘ But what?—what?—how was it?’

‘ ‘ Sir’—cried I, not well understanding him.

‘ ‘ How came you—how happened it—what?—what?’

‘ ‘ I—I only wrote, sir, for my own amusement,—only in some odd, idle hours.’

‘ ‘ But your publishing—your printing,—how was that?’

‘ ‘ That was only, sir,—only because—’

‘ I hesitated most abominably, not knowing how to tell him a long story, and growing terribly confused at these questions;—besides,—to say the truth, his own ‘ what? what?’ so reminded me of those vile Probationary Odes, that, in the midst of all my flutter, I was really hardly able to keep my countenance.

‘ The *What!* was then repeated, with so earnest a look, that, forced to say something, I stammeringly answered—

‘ ‘ I thought—sir—it would look very well in print!’

‘ I do really flatter myself this is the silliest speech I ever made! I am quite provoked with myself for it; but a fear of laughing made me eager to utter anything, and by no means conscious, till I had spoken, of what I was saying.

‘ He laughed very heartily himself,—well he might—and walked away to enjoy it, crying out,

‘ ‘ Very fair indeed! that’s being very fair and honest!’

\* \* \* \* \*

‘ While this was talking over, a violent thunder was made at the door. I was almost certain it was the Queen. Once more I would have given anything to escape; but in vain. I had been informed that nobody ever quitted the royal presence, after having been conversed with, till motioned to withdraw.

‘ Miss P—, according to established etiquette on these occasions, opened the door which she stood next, by putting her hand behind her, and slid out, backwards, into the hall, to light the Queen in. The door soon opened again, and her Majesty entered.

‘ Immediately seeing the King, she made him a low curtsey, and cried,—

‘ ‘ Oh, your Majesty is here!’

‘ ‘ Yes,’ he cried, ‘ I ran here, without speaking to anybody.’

‘ The Queen had been at the lower Lodge, to see the Princess Elizabeth, as the King had before told us.

‘She then hastened up to Mrs. Delany, with both her hands held out, saying,

‘‘My dear Mrs. Delany, how are you?’

‘‘Instantly after, I felt her eye on my face. I believe, too, she curtsied to me; but though I saw the bend, I was too near-sighted to be sure it was intended for me. I was hardly ever in a situation more embarrassing; I dared not return what I was not certain I had received, yet considered myself as appearing quite a monster, to stand stiff-necked, if really meant.

‘Almost at the same moment, she spoke to Mr. Bernard Dewes, and then nodded to my little clinging girl.

‘I was now really ready to sink, with horrid uncertainty of what I was doing, or what I should do,—when his Majesty, who I fancy saw my distress, most good-humouredly said to the Queen something, but I was too much flurried to remember what, except these words,—‘I have been telling Miss Burney—’

‘Relieved from so painful a dilemma, I immediately dropped a curtsey. She made one to me in the same moment, and, with a very smiling countenance, came up to me; but she could not speak, for the King went on talking, eagerly, and very gaily, repeating to her every word I had said during our conversation upon *Evelina*, its publication, &c. &c.

‘Then he told her of Baretti’s wager, saying,—‘But she heard of a great many conjectures about the author, before it was known, and of Baretti, an admirable thing!—he laid a bet it must be a man, as no woman, he said, could have kept her own counsel!’

‘The Queen, laughing a little, exclaimed—

‘‘Oh, that is quite too bad an affront to us!—Don’t you think so?’ addressing herself to me, with great gentleness of voice and manner.’—*Ib.* pp. 371—380.

We can spare room only for one more extract, and that a very short one. The intellect of George the Third was not of the brightest order, and the following critique on *Shakespeare* will go to confirm the general impression respecting it:—

‘From players he went to plays, and complained of the great want of good modern comedies, and of the extreme immorality of most of the old ones.

‘‘And they pretend,’ cried he, ‘to mend them; but it is not possible. Do you think it is?—what?’

‘‘No, sir, not often, I believe;—the fault, commonly, lies in the very foundation.’

‘‘Yes, or they might mend the mere speeches;—but the characters are all bad from the beginning to the end.’

‘Then he specified several; but I had read none of them, and consequently could say nothing about the matter;—till, at last, he came to *Shakespeare*.

‘‘Was there ever,’ cried he, ‘such stuff as great part of *Shakespeare*? only one must not say so! But what think you?—What?—Is there not sad stuff? What?—what?’

“Yes, indeed, I think so, sir, though mixed with such excellences, that—”

“O!” cried he, laughing good-humouredly, “I know it is not to be said! but it’s true. Only it’s Shakespeare, and nobody dare abuse him.”

“Then he enumerated many of the characters and parts of plays that he objected to; and when he had run them over, finished with again laughing, and exclaiming,

“But one should be stoned for saying so!”

The copious extracts we have given from these volumes will enable our readers to judge for themselves of the character and value of their contents. Much, as already stated, might have been omitted, without detriment to the work; yet what is sterling is sufficient to compensate for a good deal of mere trifling. The egotism and vanity of the diarist are amusingly conspicuous; nor are the volumes wholly wanting in evidence of other qualities still more reprehensible. The references to Hannah More and Sir John Hawkins are tinctured, we suspect, with somewhat of professional jealousy. We shall wait the appearance of the subsequent volumes before pronouncing our final judgment.

---

*Art. VII. The Scriptural Position of the Christian Ministry, relatively with the Civil Ruler; and the connexion between a National Establishment of the Christian Church and the permanence of that Scriptural Position. A Sermon, addressed to the Liverpool Young Men’s Established Church Society, in St. Jude’s Church, on Thursday, the 15th of April, 1841. By the Rev. Hugh M’Niel, MA., Incumbent.*

THIS lecture is extracted, as to more than its substance, from the course of lectures, delivered in London, by the Rev. Hugh M’Niel, on the church question, in 1840. After mentioning the importance of his argument, he says—

“On this account I have repeated this argument, and I will tell you another, but a minor reason. Two or three publications have emanated from distinguished dissenters, containing strictures on the lectures which I delivered in London last year; and I do not find that any of them has touched this point. Yet it forms a very prominent feature in the lectures. Arguments of very inferior interest and power are largely commented upon, while this one is left in all its unassailed importance. Modesty might, perhaps, dictate to me the supposition, that they did not think it of sufficient importance to be noticed; but as they have felt the book, of which this argument forms a main feature, to be of

sufficient importance to demand multiplied answers,\* I must be excused if I demur at such a solution of their silence upon this particular point. It has occurred to me, that they not only felt its importance, but also its stubbornness in resisting a reply. It is natural, therefore, and useful, that I should re-urge it upon their attention; since, if it cannot be answered, we are fairly entitled to the full benefit of the concession.'

p. 22.

We are not surprised that Mr. M'Niele should attribute the apparent avoidance of his great argument to its supposed strength. We are aware of no right that he had to imagine a better cause. It is natural for us to attach peculiar importance to arguments which it is our honour to have created, or to have imparted a new form and force to. The history of polemics supplies innumerable illustrations of this. It has often happened that men, who have thought they had discovered some novel mode of evincing the divinity of the Bible, have made no account at all of the old arguments drawn from the internal and external evidences. The new proof has appeared so strong as not only to enable them to do without the old ones, but even to make those old ones appear weak by contrast. So it has happened to Mr. M'Niele, we presume. Not being able to discern the 'stubbornness in resisting a reply' of his argument, we cannot but attribute its might and magnitude in his esteem to the paternal respect which he may be reasonably believed to entertain towards it. His argument, though not entirely new, has the effect of novelty. He has used it in somewhat a new way, and given to it new connexions. He certainly regards it as demonstrative. We should not be at all surprised to find him soon exposing the weakness of all other defences of church establishments, for, to say nothing now of the incompatibility between it and the most common of them, it is likely to assume to him a supreme, if not exclusive worth.

What do our readers imagine this great argument to be? Do they think it is founded on the divine prediction, or permission of church establishments? They are mistaken. Do they think it is taken from the purity and worth of the Christian ministers? They are mistaken. Do they imagine it is founded on the feebleness of the voluntary principle, and the necessity of some compulsory power to supply its defects of operation? They are mistaken. Do they suppose it is based on the temporal and national benefits accruing from the labours and offices of the clergy? They are mistaken. The great argument is derived

\* In a note here, Mr. M'Niele refers to Dr. Wardlaw's letters to himself. It is pleasing, amid the fretfulness of controversy, to find him acknowledging the excellences of his friendly adversary, in characterizing the letters as written with 'good taste, and good feeling, and good ability.'

from a principle something like that on which the heathen worship the devil, to prevent him doing them any harm. But we must state it in Mr. M'Niele's own words.

'So long as man is what he is—a creature, under the alternate influence of sinful inclination and reproving conscience ; the one stimulated by the objects of this present world, the other by the apprehension at least, if not the secret conviction of eternity,—an organized body performing the spiritual functions which undeniably belong to the Christian ministry must obtain practical power over him, for either good or evil. Appealing to the strongest affections of the human heart—hope, fear, love, conscience, gratitude, generosity ; representing the sacraments of the church as *generally*, perhaps tempted to say absolutely, necessary to salvation, and themselves as the only persons by whom those sacraments can be savingly administered, it is beyond all question, that unless subjected to some regulating restriction from without, they will, they must, in process of time, and from the bulk of mankind, obtain extravagant power and an enormous wealth. The temptations of their position will become such, as no large class of men, as such, can be reasonably expected to withstand.'—pp. 10, 11.

'Some such enactment' ('a *state enactment for the restraint of the church*,') 'is a matter of indispensable self-defence on the part of the civil ruler, to ward off the prostrating power of the clergy. He cannot, if he would, expatriate the church; and therefore, his only refuge from the thraldom of ecclesiastical tyranny lies in some such mutually regulating alliance with the ministry of the church, as will secure to them certain, safe, and manageable privileges, in lieu of an indefinite power of aggression, which they consent to sacrifice.'

'We claim such an alliance, then, on behalf of the civil government, for the security of its liberties, and on behalf of the Christian ministry, not for their temporal aggrandizement, (as many ignorantly suppose,) but for their salutary restraint and comparative purity, in order that the temporal supremacy, which would otherwise be inevitably at their option, may not be allowed to tempt them into tyranny.'—p. 15.

'Legal restraints are indispensable, not for the purpose of propagating Christianity, as has been ignorantly asserted, and superciliously and vauntingly condemned—(this is a favourite 'man of straw' with the eloquent advocates of voluntaryism,)—but for the purpose of guarding civil liberty against the systematic encroachments of the papal power. That great ecclesiastical usurpation is not content to be subject to the civil ruler. The language of St. Peter is, that **THE KING IS SUPREME**. On the contrary, the language of his boasted successor, authoritatively and still unrescinded, is, 'the priest is supreme, and the king should be in subjection.' 'Imperatores debent pontificibus subesse, non præesse.'—p. 19.

These extracts will give our readers a pretty accurate notion of what constitutes the staple of Mr. M'Niele's argument, the force of which he suspects to have quite perplexed and terrified

the 'eloquent advocates of voluntaryism.' It is clear from them, that the whole matter has been mistaken. Churchmen and dissenters, with a unanimity which they seldom display, have agreed to misunderstand the matter. The most profound ignorance has existed upon facts and theories in relation to it. The one party has defended, and the other party has attacked, a nonentity. They have both set up a 'man of straw,' for the purposes of assault and protection. It has been imagined that the subject was exhausted; but instead of that it is yet to be opened. The different parties in the controversy are to change their ground. They are to fight with each other's weapons. The churchman must learn to use the dissenter's arguments, and the dissenter the churchman's. The contest has been like a play, the plot of which is founded on the mistaking one person for another; only in this case the parties themselves have fallen into the same error as the spectators. It has been supposed on both sides, that the union of church and state was for the temporal aggrandizement of the clergy; but this was an 'ignorant' supposition, the real reason being to keep them within moderate limits, and prevent their aggrandizement going on too fast and far. It has been asserted, that the church was established to increase the power of the clergy; but this was done 'ignorantly,' too; for the actual design is to check and restrain that power. Nothing can be more absurd than to speak of the weakness of the voluntary principle, its great evil is excess of strength; nothing can be less founded on fact than the belief of the state being sanctified by the church's alliance, the end of that alliance being the 'comparative purity' of the church. To represent the Christian ministry as getting anything by the civil establishment of Christianity, is vain talking; they make an immense and astonishing sacrifice. If let alone, the people would do now as they did at the building of the tabernacle; they would give too much, and edicts must be issued, as they were then, not to goad, but to repress, their liberality. The church is established by the state to keep it in a condition of comparative poverty and wholesome check. The spiritual officers of Christianity would ruin the civil government if they were let alone. The alliance between the state and the church is designed to benefit the latter, through the restriction of its means, to prevent its amassing too much wealth and power. The church is the shrew that is to be tamed by the state, which is the resolute husband. The state imparts no sword to the church; all it does is to give her a straight waistcoat.

It is evident, further, that not only has the *design* of a church establishment been misunderstood, but also the *proper parties* to enjoy the position and privileges of one have been misunderstood

also. The argument upon which Mr. M'Niele lays such stress has a new direction as well as a new foundation. After speaking of the contest within unregenerate men, between conscience and depravity, the approbation of right and love of sin, the earnest desire for religion, and the distaste for the purity of the Christian religion, he observes—

'A system to be popular must be pliant. It must yield conveniently when sin reigns and conscience sleeps; and it must be supplied with some apparently authoritative remedy and refuge, when sin faints and conscience awakes and stings. It must oscillate in parallels with human nature, from a carnival to a Lent, from a revel to a penance, from rapacity to restitution, from dissoluteness to what it calls devotion. This will be popular with the multitude; and some modifications of this will be ready with the clergy. It can descend to grossness with the gross; and, without altering its principle, it can rise into refinement with the refined. Yes, my present argument is based, not on the externals of society, which vary with the varying circumstances of clime, and character, and knowledge, but on the unchanged and unchanging principles of our common nature. The wielders of the conscience will be also wielders of the purse, unless restrained by some salutary checks; and in such hands there is no question that money is power.'—p. 16.

From this, and from the whole tenour and language of Mr. M'Niele's remarks, it appears, then, that the principle upon which it has customarily been argued, that the selection of a church to be established should be made is altogether erroneous. It has been stoutly (but doubtless 'ignorantly') asserted, that a true and pure church only should be so signally favoured, that the right to be so treated belongs to Christianity, and Christianity protestant and apostolical. When dissenters have urged that if the civil ruler have the choice of the religion to be established, he has a right to choose which he likes, (a wretched argument, in our view, and about as good as if we should say, that because a man must believe his own opinions, therefore he has a right to believe any opinions which are his own,) the prompt reply has always been, 'Oh, no! he must no more establish error and vice than believe and practise them in his own private person. The church of Christ is the only church, and the religion of Christ the only system, that ought to be allied to the state.' This is found out to be a mistake now. The case is exactly opposite to this. As the establishment of the Christian church is designed, not to get for it money and might, but to prevent them being gotten; and as the power to get them is possessed more extensively by the professors of an erroneous and corrupt faith, than by those of the true and holy gospel, it naturally and necessarily follows, that the reasoning hitherto

approved in favour of the union of church and state is destitute of force. If a system derived any increase of power and property from the civil alliance, then protestant Christianity should be established, but as the civil alliance is meant to keep in check the tendency and ability to obtain property and power, papal Christianity should be the religion of the land. It is those, not who appeal to the grateful and intelligent sentiments of real godliness, who seek to direct the energies and anxieties of the living or dying sinner in 'the way of truth,' but those who address and employ the sordid and superstitious feelings of carnal yet fearful transgressors, that should have the fellowship and patronage of the civil government. It is not pure but impure religion which gives a priesthood the dangerous influence over souls and purses that the union of church and state is designed to restrain, says Mr. M'Niele, therefore of course Mr. M'Niele's followers, that we say not he himself, are quite in the wrong when they so vehemently protest against the very thought of aught but their own loved protestantism being allied with the state. They cannot consistently praise that protestantism, and advocate that alliance. As, according to Mr. M'Niele, the tremendous power of the clergy arises from their habit of insisting upon the importance, perhaps necessity, of the sacraments of the church, and upon 'themselves as the only persons by whom those sacraments can be savingly administered,' 'it is beyond all question' that the church of Rome should be established without the least delay. There is no other way of preserving the rights and liberties of British protestants. The catholics 'know not what they do.' They little think the measures they cogitate would ruin them. The duty of every protestant is to seek the immediate formation of a 'Protestant Association,' having for its object the establishment of popery, not in order to place catholics *in* power, but *out of* power; not to make them *rich*, but *poor*. And as to the Puseyites, they should by no means be expelled the English church and compelled to be dissenters; they never were so fit as now for the blessings of their civil position, and they are becoming fitter every day. The holy and evangelical clergy are the real parties that should secede, (so we have long thought, but for a somewhat different reason,) and we are not without hope that they will soon resign a position which their peculiar excellences render so unnecessary for them, to others who stand in such urgent need of all its advantages. It is consolatory to find that Mr. M'Niele does not consider the dissenters as at all in need of the salutary control and restrictions of an establishment. While others are to be placed under a strict and severe superintendence, they may go at large. The liberties of her Majesty's liege subjects, which would be endangered if the

clergy of other sects were allowed to do so, are placed in no peril by their unfettered freedom. ‘If it be objected, why then do not dissenting ministers, who are under no trammels of state connexion, amass wealth and consolidate power?—the answer is twofold:—first, upon their own principles they cannot, with any plausible hope of success, represent any ordinance or ordinances which are in their power exclusively to minister, as necessary to salvation; and, therefore, except in a few cases of personal attachment, their influence cannot reach the prostrating power over the conscience.’ This is a generous admission from an adversary. It is the highest praise of all to ascribe to any person an incapability of doing wrong; and the dissenting system not only presents no temptations to the evil which Mr. M’Niele denounces, but renders that evil impossible. The rule by which meetness to become an established system should be judged, is the extent of sacramental pretension; and as this exists in perfection in the Romish church, its meetness for a civil alliance is indisputable. It is painful that Mr. M’Niele should weaken his argument, by giving, as a second reason why dissenters do not become rich and powerful, the following:—‘The national church stands in their way; for any or all of their people, upon the slightest misunderstanding, or painful experience of their attempted discipline, may leave the chapel, and have the aching necessities of their nature ministered to elsewhere.’ This is certainly a singular argument, and one which, if we can comprehend it, of which we are not quite sure, may be used just as well by dissenters as by churchmen.

But to be serious. We have hitherto treated the argument before us as an amusing thing, and so it is. It is altogether so singular and ludicrous, that we can scarcely bring ourselves to regard it in any other than a playful light. When first we read it, it was with difficulty we could believe our own eyes; and if we did not know that Mr. M’Niele is a man of unquestionable honour and vigorous intellect, we should be inclined to suspect that either he was thoroughly incompetent to meddle with the controversy at all, or else that he was secretly seeking to aid the cause he ostensibly assails. We believe neither of these things; but the perusal of his lecture, without any knowledge of himself, would undoubtedly have led to one or other of these conclusions. We can assure Mr. M’Niele that he does not know dissenters, that he entirely mistakes their theological tendencies and intellectual powers, if he supposes that they are to be convinced or perplexed by such methods of ratiocination. We earnestly advise him to be content with the common and familiar defences of his principles, if he cannot discover any better than this. He will else injure, not only the establishment, but Christianity.

We have been frequently led to pause and think what impression must such a production as this make upon the mind of an intelligent sceptic, a man with no sacerdotal sympathies, and tempted to regard Christianity as the fruit and instrument of priestly craft and covetousness. It is far more likely to confirm infidels than convert dissenters.

It is surprising that Mr. M'Niele did not see, and that no kind friend has pointed out to him, that he misses the mark which he professes to aim at. He talks of the necessity of a national establishment of the Christian church to secure the permanence of the scriptural position of the Christian ministry; but we have endeavoured in vain to discover how a national establishment is necessary to this permanence. He has confined himself to general assertions, and has left us in the dark as to details. He refers, again and again, to the statutes of mortmain,\* in illustration of the necessity and efficiency of the interference of the State to keep the church in order. This is the only reference he deigns to make. To it he evidently attaches immense importance. When warmed with his subject, and fast reaching a climax of eloquent declamation, he exclaims—‘Only, then, let the checks be removed; let the regulating connexion between the clergy and the government be dissolved; let all the statutes upon the subject, the statute of mortmain included, be repealed; *all* the statutes!—for it would be a strange, one-handed voluntaryism, which would repeal the privileges, and leave the restraints unrepealed—let there be, in short, a complete dissolution of all legislative connexion between the clergy and the government, and guard yourselves, if you can, against the prostrating power of a pliant, popular theology, in the hands of a priesthood who will soon be tempted, by their multiplying opportunities, to make merchandise of your souls, and slaves of your bodies.’ (p. 16.) We really cannot feel the force of all this, in relation to the particular question before us. We did not need the clear and strong language of our author to make us understand or hate the spirit and horrors of sacerdotal tyranny. We have had too much experience of it in its milder forms, but still hard to bear, not to prefer the cruel rule of any despots, rather than the unchecked power of priests. The very word has long awakened within our

\* ‘These statutes are generally called the statutes of *mortmain*, all purchases made by corporate bodies being said to be purchases in *mortmain*, in *morta manu*; for the reason of which appellation Sir Edward Coke offers many conjectures: but there is one which seems more probable than any that he has given us—viz., that these purchases being usually made by ecclesiastical bodies, the members of which (being professed) were reckoned dead persons in law, land, therefore, holden by them, might, with great propriety, be said to be held in *morta manu*.—Blackstone, i. 479.

heart feelings of disgust and abhorrence, and we are quite convinced that the true priestly spirit, however nurtured and circumstanced, associated with orthodoxy or heresy, is opposed alike to humanity and to God. But we want to know what Mr. M'Niele's declamation has to do with the matter. In the statutes of mortmain we see no church establishment, and we have never met with a definition of one which includes the function which they discharge. The case of dissent does not require what Mr. M'Niele seems to suppose. It does not require that there should be an exception of ecclesiastics in laws made for the good of the community. The dissenter need not advocate the superiority of the clergy to the civil power. We should be sorry to see the ministry of any church exempted from the operation of those legal enactments which contemplate the national welfare at large. Mr. M'Niele must be aware that corporations, temporary as well as ecclesiastical, and corporations in which there are papists and dissenters, as well as churchmen, are affected by the statutes of mortmain. Their operation is no exclusive benefit of a national establishment.

Mr. M'Niele appears to us to be in a great and grievous dilemma. He speaks of popery, the power of popish priests, their lust of dominion and wealth, the danger to the civil interests of the country from the spread of popery, and at the same time he argues the necessity of an establishment, from its tendency to prevent the clergy amassing too much wealth, and consolidating too much power, and refers to the statutes of mortmain as an instance of the advantages of an establishment. Does he think that the ambition and covetousness of popish priests should be left without legal restraints? If so, how can he consistently use the language and express the fears with which his lecture is full? Does he think that popish priests should be taken into a friendly connexion with the civil power? Then what becomes of all his zeal for the exclusive interests of the protestant establishment? Or does he think that popish priests should be checked by laws from availing themselves of the superstitious liberality of their people, without enjoying any of the blessings of a state alliance? If so, *his* is the 'strange one-handed voluntaryism, which would withhold 'the privileges' while it imposed 'the restraints' of an establishment.

The fact is, that the statutes of mortmain do not involve the principle of an establishment at all. They may be right or wrong, without any injury to the cause of dissent. They may, and must, rest upon grounds independent of the whole controversy. The accumulating power and practices of the clergy may be dealt with in the way of legal restrictions, just as the accumulating power and practices of any other body of men may be. As

dissenters, we have nothing to do with the matter. We are not so absurd as to endeavour to shield aggrandizing priests. Let them be subject, in all the respects in which other men are subject, and on the same grounds, to the hard rule of the law. This we would maintain under all circumstances. What we would oppose is, their being favoured or frowned upon, patronised or punished, by the civil power, *because they are religious functionaries*. We have no controversy with Mr. M'Niele about the statutes of mortmain; but our controversy with him is about the relevancy of any references to those statutes to the argument in hand. Whatever they are, they are restrictions, not contributions; and as to what Mr. M'Niele says about the clergy consenting to 'sacrifice an indefinite power of aggression,' in consideration of 'certain, safe, and manageable privileges,' secured to them by a union with the government, everybody knows that such a compact is altogether imaginary; that the clergy never 'consent to sacrifice' anything; and that so far from acquiescing in the restrictive statutes of mortmain, Blackstone himself remarks—'In deducing the history of which statutes, it will be matter of curiosity to observe the great address and subtle contrivance of the ecclesiastics, in eluding, from time to time, the laws in being, and the zeal with which successive parliaments have pursued them through all their finesses:—how new remedies were still the parents of new evasions, till the legislature at last, though with difficulty, hath obtained a decisive victory.' Very like consenting to sacrifice!\*

But our most important quarrel with the author of the Lecture before us is on account of the sentiments it contains as to the Christian ministry. Our readers have had a specimen of his language in reference to their *sacramental power*, which power it is that makes it so desirable and necessary, in his view, that they should be restrained by the friendly embraces, as of a bear, of the civil government. 'Representing the sacraments of the church as *generally*, perhaps tempted to say *absolutely*, necessary to salvation, and themselves as the only persons by whom those sacraments can be savingly administered,' he thinks they must be restrained from without, to prevent them obtaining 'extravagant power and an enormous wealth.' But the following passage speaks out without any mystery:—

'I appeal to your own experience, my brethren. Under sharp and protracted sufferings of bodily pain, when the trembling flesh grasps

\* We know few passages of history which furnish a more melancholy illustration of the true sacerdotal spirit and policy where property is concerned, than the doings and devices of the clergy in connexion with this matter.—See 'Alienation in Mortmain,' Blackstone, ii. 268—274.

with eagerness at the slightest prospect of relief, when the excited memory presents, in hideous plainness, some long-forgotten sin, and conscience whispers a terrifying connexion between past sin and present pain, Divine wrath presents itself as taking vengeance and crying aloud for satisfaction,—what is to be done? What is it that *man* can do?—what has he that a man *will* not give, under such circumstances, to obtain relief? Does it not require all the power of an enlightened and holy knowledge of God, as he is indeed revealed in Jesus Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them?—does it not require all the victorious energy of a true faith, in lively exercise, to overcome the superstitious terror, and to enter into peace by the blood of atonement? Consider, then, the multitudes who have no such knowledge and no such faith. They have sin, memory, conscience, terror; a willingness to do or give anything, everything: they are materials ready prepared for the disastrous practice of a professed minister of the Christian church, who, instead of guiding the sufferer to the Saviour, the all-sufficient Saviour, avails himself of the prostration, the perturbation, we may truly call it the temporary insanity, of the ignorant sinner, to intimate that the bequest of his estate to the church would be a sacrifice well pleasing to God, and well calculated to withdraw the angry hand of present punishment. Imagine the effect of such proceedings, carried on systematically and cautiously, upon a national scale, and you will feel little difficulty in admitting, with our historians, that but for the restraints of legislative enactments, the church would have obtained possession of every foot of land in the kingdom.'—pp. 16, 17.

While reading this passage, it must be remembered that the subject of the lecture is, 'The Scriptural Position of the Christian Ministry, relatively with the Civil Ruler: and the connexion between a National Establishment of the Christian Church and the Permanence of that Scriptural Position.' Mr. M'Niele, of course, in the above extract, is speaking of what is likely to happen under the superintendence of the true ministers of the gospel. Here is our quarrel. We deny the danger of which Mr. M'Niele makes so much, in relation to the *true* ministers of the gospel. The danger may exist in relation to the priests of Rome or England, but we have yet to learn that men preaching apostolical doctrine, and filled with the apostolical spirit, would be at all likely to create or feed the superstition of wicked but fearful men, much less make merchandise of it. We therefore maintain that the argument of our author, if it have force, goes to prove the duty of establishing the wrong, not the right, religion. It has far more strength in reference to the establishment of Popery than of Protestantism, and the establishment of Puseyism than of Evangelicalism. If the necessity of allying a church with the state arise out of the danger to the liberties of men from that church's superstitious power, it is clear that the duty of allying a

church with the state must be proportioned to the extent of the danger. We presume none will deny that the Romish church is more inimical to those liberties than any other,—the Romish church ought, therefore, to be established. Mr. M'Niele's argument must fall to the ground, if it cannot be shewn that the true ministers of the gospel are likely to possess or employ the tremendous and destructive influence which he assigns to them. This cannot be shewn. We never think of such an influence when reading the records of the New Testament, but have to seek it in the ages of darkness and corruption. We never meet in the New Testament with any such view of the sacraments and the ministry as could lead legitimately to such an influence, but have to seek it in the writings of fallible men. We should much like to see the impression produced on the mind of an intelligent person, reading together and for the first time, the New Testament and Mr. M'Niele's lecture. We more than suspect that Mr. M'Niele's 'Christian church' and 'Christian ministry' would appear to him of later date and other origin than the writings of the apostles.

We cannot describe the melancholy feelings with which we have pondered portions of this lecture—feelings which have been produced by no sectarian narrowness or littleness of soul. We know Mr. M'Niele's position in the established church, the great popularity he enjoys, and the influence he exerts over both ministers and laymen. We know, too, that he ranks high for the evangelical character of his doctrines, and the courageous fidelity with which he preaches and publishes the truth. When, therefore, we find him talking of the sacraments and the ministry in the terms we have quoted, when we find him employing the danger arising from the sacerdotal and sacramental influence of the clergy to the civil rights and liberties of men as an argument for state interference, we are mournfully affected. We see even in him the baseness of Puseyism, a misconception of the proper position and function of both ministers and sacraments, and we tremble for the protestantism of a church of which such as he are among the most protestant clergy.

Mr. M'Niele cannot, according to his own admission, expect his argument to have much force with the dissenters, for he allows that 'upon their own principles, they cannot, with any plausible hope of success, represent any ordinance or ordinances which are in their power exclusively to administer as necessary to salvation; and therefore, except in a few cases of personal attachment, their influence cannot reach the prostrating point over the conscience.' With their views of the sacraments and the ministry, it will be impossible to persuade them that any civil danger resulting from the true form of Christianity can

require or justify the national establishment of that form. In so far as Mr. M'Niele's argument proves anything to them, it proves that what they believe to be unchristian and destructive error ought to be established. It does not prove *that*, but if it did, it would not make them advocates of the protestant establishment, but of a papal one. Before Mr. M'Niele can employ the reasoning of his lecture with dissenters in favour of the alliance of the state with the true church, he must convince them that his conceptions of the succession and functions of the ministry are scriptural, which he will find to be no easy task.

But though Mr. M'Niele allows that dissenters are not in danger of the evil which he asserts to exist in reference to the ministry of other Christian bodies, he declares that 'the practical evils' of their system 'have shewn themselves in other directions, as is too plainly exhibited in many of their own publications.' This is a favourite reference of churchmen, and, although not exactly connected with our present subject, we must say a word or two upon it. We allow, then, that the history of dissenting churches has exhibited many grievous evils. We defend the truth, and this is part of it. Instead of *concealing* what we mourn, the only way, we are convinced, to destroy, is to *reveal* it. We do not blame (as some are disposed to do) those honest dissenters, such as Mr. James and Mr. Binney, who have published to the world the faults of their own body,—we honour them; they go the most direct way towards a reformation. Neither do we regret the violent and energetic use which churchmen have made of the self-exposures of dissenters. They may not have meant kindness, but they have done us good. It may be easy for us to defend ourselves from our enemies, but it may be necessary sometimes for our enemies to defend us from ourselves. But while we are free to say all this, we do think that churchmen should be modest in appealing to the disputes and divisions, and other evils, which are admitted too frequently to take place among us. Have they forgotten the almost endless host of publications by *clerical reformers* which have appeared even within the last few years? Have they forgotten the works of Cox, Acaster, Riland, and others, who, with a courage which, it is to be feared, has died before themselves, denounced the inconsistencies and atrocities of the establishment, and proved that its evils possess an enormity and a force infinitely greater than can be predicated of those of dissent? Nor is it to be forgotten, that in estimating the evils of different systems, we must separate the *natural* from the *accidental*. The evils of dissent, in a great majority of instances, arise from the abandonment of its principles, those of the establishment from its own necessary operation. Besides which, it may be safely said, that many of

the evils which we confess prove the identity of our system with that of the apostolical church. We are accustomed to argue that our evangelical doctrines are scriptural, because they are liable to the same abuses and objections as are supposed and guarded against in the New Testament; and we can, in the same way, argue that our polity is scriptural, because in the first churches, churches established and superintended by the apostles, the same evils existed as exist among ourselves—evils which cannot exist among our opponents, although they have evils of a larger magnitude and a more mighty force.

---

## Literary Intelligence.

### *In the Press.*

Preparing for publication, in two volumes, *The United Irishmen, their Times and Lives.* By Dr. R. R. Madden, Author of *Travels in Turkey, Egypt, &c.* This work will contain particulars, never before made public, respecting the plans, object, and conduct of the United Irishmen, the means by which their secrets were betrayed to the government, and their measures frustrated. It will include documents furnished by persons who were actually engaged in the councils of the United Irishmen, and among them may be specified the particulars of the arrest of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, &c. Materials for this work has involved labour of many years.

### *Just Published.*

*Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Michael Thomas Sadler, Esq., M.P., F.R.S.*

*The Great Commission; or, The Christian Church constituted and charged to convey the Gospel to the World.* By Rev. John Harris, D.D.

*The Pictorial Edition of Shakspeare—Pericles.*

*England in the Nineteenth Century: Cornwall, Part III.; Lancashire, Part III.*

*The Way of Life.* By Charles Hodge, of New Jersey.

*Lucilla; or, The Reading of the Bible.* By Adolphe Monod. Translated from the French.

*Antinomianism, its Errors, Evils, and Absurdities.* By Rev. W. Thorn, Winchester.

*The Baptism of the Heir Apparent. A Sermon,* by William Brock, Norwich.

*Bells and Pomegranates, King Victor and King Charles.* By Robert Browning, Author of *Paracelsus.*

*The Martyr of Prusa.* By Rev. R. W. Kyle.

*The Fortunes of Faith; or, Church and State: a Poem.* By T. H. Gill.

*Observations on the Book of Ruth, and on the Word 'Redeemer.'* By Rev. H. B. Macartney.

*Taste: a Lecture.* By Rev. R. Jones, Vicar of Bedfont.

*A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities.* Part 27.

*Family Record; or, Memoir of late Rev. B. Woodd, and of several Deceased Members of his Family.*

Translations from the German, in Prose and Verse. By Henry Reeve and John Edward Taylor.

Characteristics of Painters. By Henry Reeve.

Lectures to Young Men. By Rev. A. Thomson, W. Cunningham, Alex. Fraser, and D. T. K. Drummond.

Reasons why I, a Jew, have become a Catholic, and not a *Roman Catholic*. By Ridley H. Herschell.

Three Discourses: On the Divine Will; On Acquaintance with God; On Revelation. By A. J. Scott.

Sketches of Sermons, designed for Special Occasions. By a Dissenting Minister.

These Times: a Tract for the Young. By John Jefferson.

The Pilgrims of Glencoe, and other Poems. By Thomas Campbell.

Greece as a Kingdom; or, a Statistical Description of that Country, from 1833 to the present time. By Fred. Strong, Esq.

A Manual explanatory of Congregational Principles. By George Payne, LL.D.

Hints Illustrative of the Duty of Dissent. By Rev. Thomas Binney. Third edition.

What to Teach, and How to Teach it. By Henry Mayhew. Part I.

Missions, their Authority, Scope, and Encouragement: an Essay. By R. W. Hamilton.

Le Keux' Memorials of Cambridge. Parts 24 and 25.

The Church Principles of Nice, Rome, and Oxford, compared with the Christian Principles of the New Testament. By a Member of the Church of England.

Brief Memorials of the late Rev. B. M. Mathias, of Bethesda Chapel.

The Drunkard: a Poem. By John O'Neill. With Illustrations by Geo. Cruikshank.

Memoirs of the Life, Character, and Ministry of William Dawson, late of Bambow, near Leeds. By James Everett.

The Mabinogion, from the *Llyfr Coch o Hergest* and other Antient Welsh MSS.; with an English Translation and Notes. By Lady Charlotte Guest. Part IV.

Nothing New; or, The Judgment of the Old Divines on Sentiments agitated in their day, and now revived by 'the Brethren' and others.

The Slave States of America. By J. S. Buckingham, Esq. 2 vols.

Discourse on the Enlarged and Pendulous Abdomen. By Richard Frankum, Surgeon.

Theodoxa: a Treatise on Divine Praise. By Nathaniel Rowton.

The History of Italy and Switzerland, for the Young. By Miss Julia Corner.

An Examination of No. 90 of the Tracts for the Times. By Rev. F. Beasley, D.D., Pennsylvania.

Which is the Wiser? a Tale. By Mary Howitt.

Moral Agency, and Man as a Moral Agent. By William M'Combie.

Luther: a Poem. By Robert Montgomery, M.A.

Elements of Mental and Moral Science. By Geo. Payne, LL.D. Second edition.

Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ, &c. By John Pye Smith, D.D., F.R.S. Second edition.

A Visit to the United States in 1841. By Joseph Sturge.

Christian Consistency. By E. Mannering.